THE SHAKESPEARE ASSOCIATION BULLETIN

SAMUEL A. TANNENBAUM, *Editor*

Contributing Editors

MRS. ROBERT CARLTON MORRIS ROBERT M. SMITH WILLIAM T. HASTINGS

Advisory Board

JOSEPH Q. ADAMS HARDIN CRAIG WILLIAM ALLAN NEILSON

VOL. 4 APRIL, 1939 NO. 2

CONTENTS

PAGE

The Cotswold Games ..... *Frontispiece* 66

Shakspere's Part in *Pericles* ..... *William T. Hastings* 67

The Fencing Bout in *Hamlet* ..... *Selma Guttman* 86

Index of Names and Subjects in the 1938 Bibliography ..... *Robert W. Babcock* 101

The Reflective Element in Falstaff ..... *Samuel A. Small* 108

Editorial Notes and Comments ..... *S. A. Tannenbaum* 127

Published quarterly, in January, April, July, and October, by The Shakespeare Association of America, Inc., 601 West 113th Street, New York.

Subscription rate, $2.00 per year, postpaid. Single copies, fifty cents.

Membership in the Association includes annual subscription.

All correspondence relating to the conduct of the BULLETIN should be addressed to Dr. Samuel A. Tannenbaum, 601 West 113th Street, New York, N. Y.

Other matters relating to the work of the Association should be referred to the Secretary.

Copyright, 1937, by The Shakespeare Association of America, Inc.

THE COTSWOLD GAMES.

Frontispiece of *Annalia Dubrensia* (1638)
as reproduced by Grosart

SHAKSPERE'S PART IN *PERICLES*

By WILLIAM T. HASTINGS

I

IN a recent article[1] I have endeavored to show that the non-Shaksperian parts of *Pericles* were not written by George Wilkins. As a preliminary to my argument it was necessary to make certain assumptions concerning the relation in time of Shakspere's work to that of the other author and concerning the extent and character of Shakspere's contribution. To these related questions I shall now turn.

II

PERICLES NOT WHOLLY SHAKSPERE'S

After the often pedestrian and stiff lines of Acts I and II of *Pericles* there comes, as many have noted, a sudden exhilarating shock when, with the opening words of the hero in Act III, Scene i, "the full swell of the incomparable Shakespearian verse bursts upon us."[2] *Pericles* is probably the only play in the accepted canon which thus immediately conveys to the reader the certainty of the presence both of Shakspere and (by contrast) of someone else. Not even the Fletcher-Shakspere conjunction in *Henry VIII* would seem so sure. But the argument for divided authorship[3] has been pressed largely on other than stylistic and metrical grounds: the omission of the play from the First Folio; its treating such unpalatable and "un-Shaksperian" subjects as incest and life in a brothel; the wandering story, the loose construction, and the employment of the crude devices of chorus and dumbshow; the faintness of the characterization. These latter impeachments, however, will not stand inspection. The subject matter was not distasteful to the Elizabethans. Criticism of the dramatic technique has

---

[1] "*Exit* George Wilkins," *S. A. B.*, April, 1936, pp. 67-83.

[2] Mackail, J. W.: *The Approach to Shakespeare*, 1930, p. 93. Acts I and II have a relatively low percentage of run-on lines and a relatively high percentage of rhymed couplets. In the later acts the proportions are reversed.

[3] The history of the authorship debate is too complicated to be dealt with here except summarily. For a comprehensive survey see Steinhauser, K.: *Die Neueren Anschauungen über die Echtheit von Shakespeare's Pericles*, 1917.

evidential value only if the play is supposed originally Shakspere's or completely recast by him; and, in any case, is not of great weight, for he has used the chorus elsewhere, and has done great violence to the unities (as in *The Winter's Tale*). The ground of exclusion from the Folio is uncertain.[4] Nevertheless, the undoubted great disparity of style and versification in the earlier and the later parts of the play lends support to the view, still that of the majority of scholars, that Shakspere's work is exclusively or almost exclusively to be found in Acts III and V and the verse scenes of Act IV.

Dryden explained the defects of the play as those of inexperience.[5] A few later critics, seeing this view to be untenable, have supposed it an early play[6] partly rewritten in his last period. But the stylistic defects of Shakspere's prentice work were errors of taste—excessive or misplaced lyricism or flashing quips or flowing rhetoric—not such dullness as still remains in *Pericles*. Nor can the feebler passages be explained as corruptions of a Shaksperian original, or improvisations by a "reporter," for the vicissitudes of the text have not obscured at all the Shaksperian character of the poetry of the later acts.[7] Almost no modern critics, in fact, have tried to claim the whole play for Shakspere.

---

[4]Not by Shakspere? But it *is*, at least in part. Only partly by Shakspere? But other plays commonly thought to be of divided authorship are included. Copyright difficulties? Possibly, yet the original edition was a theft. Overlooked by the editors? But the play was still decidedly popular in 1623.

[5]"Shakesper's own Muse her *Pericles* first bore,
The Prince of Tyre was elder than the Moore." Prologue to Ch. Davenport's *Circe*, 1684.

[6]The metrical statistics for Acts I and II are not unlike those of *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, *The Comedy of Errors*, and *Richard II*.

[7]We do not, it is true, know what was Shakspere's earliest manner. It is conceivable that he had a pre-Lylyan, pre-Marlovian, pre-lyrical vein, traces of which are to be discerned in *1Henry VI*, *A Comedy of Errors*, and *Two Gentlemen of Verona*. It is barely possible that *Pericles*, plainly phrased in stiff pentameters, the first heir of Shakspere's invention, might be corrupted into the bathetic passages of Acts I and II. Also it may be noted that Shakspere's early acquaintance with the Apollonius story has been argued from the similarity between it and the Ægeon-Æmilia plot in *The Comedy of Errors*. But until there are more facts to build upon, the conjecture need not be seriously entertained.

III

PERICLES THE RESULT OF SHAKSPERE'S REVISION OF A PREVIOUS PLAY

If it be agreed that there are at least two "hands" in this play, in what relation do they stand to each other? How is the work combined? In 1864 Fleay, following the lead of Delius, popularized the view that the main text of Acts I and II was by George Wilkins, the brothel scenes in Act IV and the choruses by William Rowley, and the remainder of Acts III to V by Shakspere. Later critics have retained this convenient division of the play, however they may have disagreed as to who the authors were, what parts of the play they wrote, and how the division of authorship came about. Most later critics have not escaped, either, from the influence of false assumptions about Wilkins's novel[8] and unnecessary assumptions about the date of *Pericles* which early became widespread. They have variously conjectured: (1) that Shakspere worked in active collaboration with one or more others; (2) that the incomplete play of another dramatist (supposedly Wilkins) was turned over to Shakspere to finish or that the incomplete play about Marina by Shakspere was turned over to others (Wilkins and Rowley) to finish; (3) that Shakspere wrote a play that was later vulgarized by another; (4) that Shakspere took up a complete play by another dramatist and revised and rewrote it.

(1) Active collaboration between Shakspere and another dramatist is highly improbable. There is no clear instance of such collaboration by him, except in the very special circumstances of the probable collaboration with Fletcher in *Henry VIII* and *The Two Noble Kinsmen.* That in the plenitude of his power Shakspere would join forces with so inferior a collaborator as the supposed joint-author of *Pericles* is unbelievable. There would seem to be no reason for it, and it would seem likely to be contrary to Shakspere's wishes. Furthermore, Shakspere's habit in collaboration, if it may be inferred from the Shakspere-Fletcher plays, was to set the pace and tone and outline the

[8] See *"Exit* George Wilkins?" *loc. cit.*

characters by writing the opening scenes; *Pericles* does not show this.

(2) It is improbable that the play was done piecemeal, one person beginning and dropping it (or having it taken away from him) and another completing it. If George Wilkins, for example, had made a bad start in a play[10] and it was transferred to Shakspere, it is improbable that the confessedly unsatisfactory work of Wilkins would have been preserved by Shakspere. The contrary theory that Shakspere did the Marina story, without the brothel scenes, and that Wilkins or Wilkins and Rowley completed it is a product of Victorian "niceness." Not only would the Marina story by itself not make a play, but as comparison with the source story shows, both preliminary action and the brothel scenes are essential parts of the whole.[11] In fact, if Gower's poem and the play be read together, the conclusion is inescapable that the whole play in its original form was shaped out of the poem at one time: first, a passage condensed and paraphrased in a Gower chorus, then a portion expanded into the dialogue and action of the first Act, then a passage paraphrased in the second chorus, then expansion into drama, and so on.[12]

(3) The theory that a Shaksperian play was vulgarized by some inferior dramatist is absurd. Plays were often revised, and sometimes vulgarized. But there is no evidence of more than very minor touching up of Shakspere's plays by later hands and none while he was actively connected with the theatre. The King's men were too sensible to see an advantage in vulgarizing Shakspere; even if Shakspere himself would have assented.

---

[10]*Cf.* the conjecture of Chambers: ". . . he took up the silly piece which George Wilkins had been allowed to begin for the King's men in his absence [from illness], and put in the latter end of it the beautiful idyll. . . ." (*Shakespeare: A Survey*, 284). In *William Shakespeare* (I. 526) he conjectures that "there was an earlier play," and that "a new version was written by Shakespeare and another."

[11]Deighton, K.: *Pericles*, 1907, p. xxiv.

[12]Compare, for instance, Gower, ll. 543-633, with *Pericles*, I. iv., 84-108 and Chorus of Act II; Gower, ll. 954-1140, with the Chorus of Act III and its relation to the following scene; Gower, ll. 1222-1372, with *Pericles*, III, iii, iv, IV Prologue and Sc. i (in the play the order of events is inverted in III, iii, iv.).

(4) The only tenable view is that Shakspere worked over a completed play. This he had previously done many times and it was presumably a congenial task. The difference between this and previous plays is that we have here a complete rewriting only of the last three acts. Evidence that *Pericles* is partly revised and partly rewritten from a complete play is to be found in (a) some Shaksperian passages in the first half of the play and (b) some probable vestiges of the old play (not eliminated in rewriting) in the parts which in the main are assignable to Shakspere.[13] Coleridge's explanation of the circumstances may be correct:[14] "At first he proceeded with indifference, only now and then troubling himself to put in a thought or an image, but as he advanced he interested himself in his employment . . ."

It has also been suggested that Shakspere, being attracted to the project by the story of Marina, lavished his attention on the later portion of the story, revising the first two acts only enough to make them tolerable.

IV

WHAT PART OF THE PLAY IS BY SHAKSPERE?

In a sense the whole play is Shakspere's, since he must assume responsibility for the quality of those portions of the previous play which he retained. And more of the play is phrasally his than is even now usually believed—much more than the minimum assigned him by Victorian "idolators." The discrimination of the authorship in detail is, however, necessarily tentative, and can be supported only in part by objective evidence. General literary impressions are subjective and not susceptible of proof; and though often considered valid (as, for instance, in allotting Act III, Scene 1 to Shakspere), they will often carry little weight in the face of a contrary hypothesis. The problem is not unlike that confronting Hector when he would slay that part of Ajax' "commixtion" which was Greek and spare that which was borrowed from "my sacred aunt."

[13]See below, pp. 9-10.
[14]Crabb Robinson's *Diary*, I. 198; under date of Dec. 2, 1810.

Among objective tests the metrical statistics show a sharp difference in versification between Acts I and II, and Acts III to V:[15]

	% short lines	% split lines	% rhyme	% fem. endings	% run-on lines	No. light endings
Acts I-II ...	7	3	24	16	13	6
Acts III-V..	13	15	4	28	26	26

Not too much should be argued from these figures. They cannot be taken at their face value, because of the highly hypothetical character of the reconstructed text. Moreover, if any Shaksperian passages do occur in the first two Acts—as they certainly do—the figures are vitiated by them to some degree. Nor can metrical tests be used to segregate such short Shaksperian passages; statistics are of very limited value for anything shorter than an act.[16]

Other evidence not purely subjective—similarities of situation, of character conception, of diction, and "parallel pasages"—will have some relevance to the problem.

(1) The main text of Acts III, IV, and V—excluding the brothel scenes (IV, ii, v, vi) and the three speeches by Gower which by modern editors are classed as "scenes" (IV, iv, V, ii, V, iii, end)—has, with very few reservations, been regularly allotted to Shakspere. Fleay and some others reject the vision of Diana in V. I, 241-52, just as many reject the vision in *Cymbeline* and the Juno-Ceres passage in the *Tempest.* But there is every reason to suppose that the Elizabethans approved of bringing gods and goddesses, fairies and devils, and disembodied spirits upon the stage along with men;[17] and stylistically the passage is Shaksperian. For these scenes as a whole there is no need to

[15]My figures. The percentages (except the short-line %) are based on the total number of full pentameter lines, exclusive of the choruses.

[16]Chambers: *William Shakespeare,* I, 221.

[17]Greene's *James IV* and *Friar Bacon;* Marlowe's *Faustus;* Peele's *Arraignment of Paris* and *Old Wive's Tale;* Shakspere's *Midsummer Night's Dream,* Hymen in *As You Like it,* his witches, his ghosts, the oracular utterance from Apollo in *The Winter's Tale;* and Heywood's *Age* plays.

assemble proofs: the cadence, the phrasing, the verse statistics all match the plays of 1606-10.

(2) The brothel scenes are by Shakspere. Formerly they were rejected by the critics; but Brandes, Raleigh, Deighton, Thomas, Boas, Chambers, and some others now assign them to Shakspere. It would seem that there never should have been a doubt. The rejecters argue that they are vulgar and unworthy of Shakspere; that he would not have written or countenanced such scenes. But in *Measure for Measure* and *2 Henry IV,* we have comic handling of similar materials, and there is in the other plays widespread comic recognition of vice; the Elizabethan unconsciousness of offence in such themes is shown by their popularity—see Middleton's *Blurt: Master Constable,* Marston's *Dutch Courtesan,* Dekker's *Honest Whore* (like *Pericles* exhibiting virtue in a brothel), Heywood's *The Royal King and the Loyal Subject,* etc. In *Pericles,* moreover, these scenes are central in the drama, essential to the climax of the admittedly Shaksperian story of Marina. The brothel incidents are in the original story, were certainly in the original play, and Shakspere took them over and made them his.

Nearly all the dialogue of the brothel scenes is in prose and it is more difficult to demonstrate the authorship of prose than of verse. But there are here plentiful signs of Shakspere. The proprietors of the brothel are drawn with his humorous, not satirical, touch; their simple pride in their profesion is like that of Abhorson, the executioner, in *Measure for Measure:* their logic is the typical logic of the Shaksperian clown. The wittty phrasing and the quibbles which follow through from sentence to sentence are not matched outside Shakspere. No one but Shakspere could have put in the mouth of the Bawd such phrases as her retort to Marina's cry of of distress ("Diana, aid my purpose!"), "What have we to do with Diana?" or her scornful protest at the girl's ostentatious virtue, "Marry, come up, my dish of chastity with rosemary and bays!"

The comparatively short passages of verse in these scenes

have a Shaksperian character. Fleay, noting the metrical irregularities in IV, vi, 99-128, 171 ff, assigned the verse to Rowley with the rest of these scenes. The irregularity, which is perhaps greater here than is usual in the play, is undoubtedly in part, and perhaps wholly, due to excessive corruption of the text; it may in part be due to incomplete rewriting of the original play, or to a Shaksperian negligence such as is frequent in *Timon of Athens*. But the hand of Shakspere is undeniable in most of the speeches; and if so, then presumably it touched all. Marina certainly speaks the same language as in her earlier and later appearances; Lysimachus is like his later self; and if, as Deighton believes, Shakspere reconceived the character of Lysimachus, there can be no question that the latter's language is Shaksperian.

(3) The Gower choruses present a more difficult problem than anything in the last three acts of the play. Most critics have denied Shakspere any part in them, though Delius believed, as does Thomas, that Shakspere rewrote some of the later choruses, and Saintsbury assigns them all to Shakspere. From the point of view of the older theory of collaborating or originally divided authorship complete scepticism regarding the choruses was perhaps natural, but if it is agreed that Shakspere undertook the revision of a completed play containing chouses, it is necessary to scrutinize each chorus for signs of revision or rewriting.

Five of the eight choruses are substantially in iambic tetrameter couplets but with a few lines of pentameter; the other three are substantially in rhymed pentameters. As Gower's version of the story is written in tetrameters, it seems likely that in the original play the "presenter" (Gower) spoke throughout all eight choruses in that meter. It is natural to infer that the choruses in pentameter have been rewritten, and are by Shakspere. The sixth chorus, that serving as prologue to Act V, has, it is true, a rhythmical movement less free than that of the dialogue in Acts III-V, perhaps partly because following too closely the original form of the chorus. It has more run-on lines, however, than the

un-Shaksperian verse in the earlier acts, some of the cadences are thoroughly Shaksperian,[18] and Shaksperian phrasal parallels are easily accumulated.[19] The preceding chorus, Act IV, Scene iv, has greater fluency and an equally Shaksperian phraseology; there are close parallels to the chorus formulas of *Henry V* and *The Winter's Tale*.[20] The dumbshow is no doubt carried over from the old play and the artificiality of the inscription on Marina's monument, the first lines of which are in tetrameter, suggests that it has been incompletely revised. The third pentameter speech of Gower, the Epilogue (V, iii, 85 ff), is more problematical. The verse is formal and authentic, like the thought; the last couplet but one is even mechanical; and so moralistic a conclusion may seem unShaksperian. Yet the verse has verve, the phrasing in the main is excellent, and the formality may be thought of as appropriate to a masque-like conclusion which binds the whole play together by a moral significance. In dealing with all the choruses it has to be remembered, too, that in them, as in "speeches" interpolated in a dramatic context, Shakspere habitually employed a formality (no doubt thinking it appropriate to statuesque rôles) in marked contrast to the body of the

---

[18] *Cf.* ll. 1-7.

[19] *Cf.* (a) "Deep clerks she dumbs" (1, 5).
"Where I have come, great clerks have purposed
To greet me with premeditated welcomes;
Where I have seen them tremble and look pale,
. . . . . .
And in conclusion dumbly have broke off . . ."
M.N.D., V, i, 93-99.

(b) ". . . and with her neele composes
Nature's own shape, of bud, bird, branch, or berry,
That even her art sisters the natural roses.
Her incle, silk, twin with the rubied cheery . . ." (ll. 5-8).
"We, Hermia, like two artificial gods,
Have with our needles created both one flower,
. . . . . .
. . . . . So we grew together,
Like to a double cherry . . ." *M.N.D.*, III, ii, 203-09.

(c) "As goddes-like" (l. 4).
"More goddess-like. *Cymb.*, III, ii, 8.
"Most goddess-like." *W.T.*, IV, iv, 10.

[20] *Cf.* (a) "Thus time we waste and long leagues make short,
Sail seas in cockles, have an wish but for't,
Making, to take your imagination,
From bourn to bourn, region to region.
By you being pardoned, we commit no crime . . ."
(ll. 1-5).

plays in which they stand.[21] Set speeches of narrative or exposition, also, especially when following a source closely, often drop down to a region adjacent to prose.[22] There are sufficient Shaksperian traits, then, in these three choruses, and any abnormalities in them may be accounted for in the ways just suggested.

What of the choruses written principally in tetrameters? The rejection of these has been well night unanimous: because of the archaisms, the tasteless diction, the wooden verse. This judgment is undiscriminating and as a generalization cannot stand.

If one makes due allowance for the natural formality of "set" speeches such as these, and recognizes that Shakspere would undoubtedly find himself much more cramped in rhymed tetrameter than in the normal unrhymed pentameter, one may unhesitatingly assign a considerable portion

---

"For 'tis your thoughts that now must deck our Kings,
Carry them here and there, jumping o'er times . . ."
Henry V, I, Prol., 28-29.

"I, that please some . . . . . .
Now take upon me, in the name of Time,
To use my wings. Impute it not a crime . . ."
W.T., IV, i, 1-4.

(b) "Patience, then . . ." ll. 50).
"Who, prologue-like, your humble patience pray . . ."
Henry V, I, Prol. 33.
"Your patience this allowing . . ." *W.T.*, IV, i, 15.

(c) "Pericles
Is now again thwarting the wayward seas,
. . . . . .
. . . . . think his pilot thought;
So with his steerage shall your thoughts grow on . . ."
(ll. 9-19).

"Follow, follow!
Grapple your minds to sternage of this navy
. . . . . .
Work, work your thoughts . . ." *Henry V*, II, Prol. 17-25.
"Heave him away upon your winged thoughts
Athwart the sea." *Henry V*, *V*, Prol. 8-9.

[21]See for "speeches" the player's speech on Hecuba, and the play within the play, in *Hamlet,* and the masque interludes in several plays; for formal and even stiff chorus speeches, see *Henry V,* Chorus to Act II, ll. 20-42, and Epilogue; *Troilus and Cressida,* Prologue, and Epilogue (last speech of Pandarus) V, x, 48-57; *Winter's Tale,* Chorus to Act IV.

[22]See Canterbury on the *"law salique," Henry V,* I, ii, 35-95; Friar Lawrence's summary of events, *Romeo and Juliet,* V, iii, 231-64.

of these choruses to him. The dull lines of the chorus preceding Act II and the description of the girlish accomplishments of Marina in the lines preceding Act IV are not from the same pen. To go further in a detailed partition of the choruses involves setting up a judgment on personal impressions, but a tentative schedule of Shaksperian passages may be ventured:

Chorus 1 (preceding Act I). Lines 1-16: extensive revision but not complete rewriting. Lines 41-42: these last two lines have no basis in Gower, are in pentameter, and are perhaps a Shaksperian addition. Lines 17-40 are probably not Shaksperian.

Chorus 2 (preceding Act II). This, the poorest of the Gower speeches, may serve to show what they were all like before Shakspere put his hand to them, and to support the claim that the others are now largely Shaksperian. The archaisms are labored and the phrasing is without a sparkle. It is not by Shakspere.[28]

Chorus 3 (preceding Act III). Lines 1-14 are certainly Shakspere's, though the substance is to be found in Gower and was presumably in the original chorus. For mood and style, see *A Midsummer Night's Dream,* V, i, 378ff.

The rest of the chorus has vigor of movement and firmness of phraseology and is probably a fairly free revision by Shakspere, with some archaisms, and perhaps some elliptical constructions, taken over from the original.

Chorus 4 (preceding Act IV). This is the most vivid and flowing of the tetrameter choruses, and represents an independent rehandling of the material by Shakspere. Possibly a few vestiges of the original chorus remain; *e.g.,* II, 15-16, and the closing couplet, II, 51-52. Lines 3-8, 13-14, 20-35, 37-41, 43-50 have no parallel in Gower.

Chorus 7 (Act V, Sc. ii). All by Shakspere; note the great metrical freedom and the easy neatness of the phrasing. There are no phrasal parallels in Gower.

---

[28]See R. M. Garret: "Gower in *Pericles*" (*Shak. Jahrb.,* 48: 13) for an unplausible attempt to claim all for Shakspere; this tedious prolixity, in his view, being in character, part of the "masterly portrait of the man as the Elizabethans conceived him."

This schedule allots to Shakspere 151 lines (including seven sporadic pentameters), and to the other author 67 lines (including two pentameters), or 7/10 and 3/10 respectively. The portions here assigned to Shakspere vary a good deal in fluency and in poetic beauty, but all show aptness of phrasing and compression and vigor of style quite beyond the author of the worst lines; and the best have the unmistakable Shaksperian quality of expression.

The choruses have also been repudiated on the alleged ground that Shakspere's tetrameter verse is always trochaic, never iambic. Even if one does not press the argument that there is no fundamental distinction between iambic and trochaic meters, this supposed axiom regarding Shakspere's metrical practice will not survive a scrutiny of his verse. His most common tetrameter line is an intermediate form in seven syllables, both beginning and ending with a metrical stress. Among the lines with four complete feet there are more "iambs" than "trochees." In general it may be said that, although Shakspere shows a strong tendency to begin the line with a stressed syllable, he handles his tetrameters with considerable freedom, in the interest of variety, and that he uses full "iambs" to a considerable extent.[24]

Now the meter of the tetrameter Gower choruses is less uniform than is usually assumed, and a tabulation both reveals this variety and supports surprisingly the discrimination of authorship just proposed on literary grounds.

TENTATIVE CLASSIFICATION ON LITERARY GROUNDS

	"Shaksperian	"non-Shaksperian"
Iambic: 1st foot substitute trochee	17 (11.2%)	13 (20%)
No. lines	151	67
Pentameter	7	2
Complete trochaic	2 (1.3%)	..
Iambic: feminine ending	6 (4%)	2 (3%)
Begin and end with stress	10 (6.6%)	..
Run-on lines	45 (30%)	11 (16%)

[24]This statement simplifies drastically a somewhat complicated topic to which I hope to return later.

A certain amount of error, each way, in the classification on literary grounds must be assumed, and it must be remembered that the total number of lines is too small for fully significant computation. It is nevertheless interesting to find about double the proportion of substitute first feet and half the proportion of run-on lines in the "non-Shaksperian" group that are found in the "Shaksperian," and ten lines beginning and ending with a stress in the "Shaksperian" group against none at all in the other.

(4) What, if anything, did Shakspere contribute to Acts I and II? To this, the most difficult question of all, the answer has usually been "nothing." Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch singled out as Shakspere's a few lines in I, i.[25] Deighton conjectures: "Finding that the Antiochus and Simonides stories were worked out in a fairly adequate manner, and feeling little interest in those stories, he was at no great pains to interfere with the original author; though if we may judge from the prose versions, he improved both Acts by compression, and, unless I am mistaken, rewrote in a great measure the first scene of the second Act."[26] Thomas,[27] the only pro-Shaksperian who has taken the two acts up systematically, scene by scene, on ground of subject matter, general treatment, style, and versification, assigns to Shakspere I. i. 100-02, 150-71; I. iii (entire); II. i (mostly). Abercrombie,[28] speaking of the whole play, declares (without specifications): "were I playing the scientific game, I could detect Shakespeare's hand in it throughout." The "scientific game" is particularly difficult to play here and no thoroughgoing and confident separation of authors can be made. Textual corruptions and intermittent retouchings by Shakspere seriously impair the value of the metrical statistics; parallels in phraseology and in situations between these acts and the known works of Shakspere never carry full conviction. Again, one alloca-

[25] *Shakespeare's Workmanship*, 1917, p. 220; see alo Chambers: *William Shakespeare*. I, 220.

[26] Deighton, K.: *Pericles*, p. xxvi.

[27] In *Engl. Stud.*, XXXIX, 210-14.

[28] "A Plea for Liberty of Interpreting"; in *Aspects of Shakespeare*, pp. 242-43.

[29] For my guess at his character as a poet, see *"Exit* George Wilkins?" *loc. cit.*, p. 75.

tion of particular scenes or passages to Shakspere or to the second author depends somewhat on who the second author is assumed to be, and upon one's notion of the latter's vein in falsifying and in conceiving situations and characters.[29] In *Pericles,* besides, we probably have a unique case of all degrees of reworking within the single play: imaginative recreation, rewriting along lines laid down by the original author, interpolated passages, retouching of lines. In all but the first of these the normal Shaksperian movement and manner will be modified, and the difficulty of positive identification increased. Nevertheless one may venture the attribution of certain scenes, parts of scenes, and isolated lines, to Shakspere on general literary grounds (the phrasing, the flexibility of the verse, the atmosphere); and possibly one can support the attributions to some degree by more objective tests.

Speaking generally, it may be said that in contrast to the almost complete re-creation of Acts III-V, in the earlier Acts no scene is completely reconceived and rewritten. The nearest approach to "pure Shakespeare" is in the scene between Pericles and the fishermen, II. i. This dialogue has a Shaksperian humor, the kindly condescension of Pericles is like that of Hamlet to the gravediggers, and most of the verse has the Shaksperian ease and vigor.[30] Some passages, however, in the latter part of the scene,[31] seem only partly rewritten. Act II, Scene v, one may guess, illustrates the rewriting of a scene without much recreation and with the retention of some old lines. The preceding chapter in the love story of Pericles and Thaisa (II. iii), conversely, seems to contain a few definitely Shaksperian lines with a limited and indeterminate amount of retouching. Short passages which strike one immediately as Shaksperian are III, iii, 17-18.

> And you are her labour'd scholar. Come, queen o' the feast,—
> For, daughter, so you are,—here take your place.[32]

and in II, v, (ll. 49-50, 66) variants on Brabantio and Othello:

---

[30]See Thomas for further arguments, pp. 212-13.
[31]Beginning line 126.
[32]*Cf. The Winter's Tale,* IV, iv, 67-68.

> Thou hast bewitch'd my daughter, and thou art
> A villain.
>
> . . . . . .
>
> Here comes my daughter, she can witness it.[33]

In Act I the effort of Shakspere seems to have been mainly directed to enlivening these talky scenes with bits of brisk action, as in the Thaliard business in Scene i and the beginning and end of Scene iii, the Helicanus-Pericles dialogue of Scene ii, and the arrival of Pericles at Tarsus in scene iv.

It would be tedious to include in the body of this essay further detail of my Shaksperian attributions in Acts I and II. They are listed, with a brief commentary, in a note at the end.[34] The commentary is hampered by the fact that I have yet to reveal my candidate for the doubtful honor of the original authorship and cannot now do so without begging the question in some degree.

There is a question of minor interest which has not received much attention from the critics: Was Shakspere or the original dramatist responsible for the changes in the names of the characters? There is slight evidence in favor of ascribing certain changes to Shakspere:

(1) Shakspere, it is known, tends to simplify the names found in his sources, to employ Latinized forms, and to re-replace the unfamiliar by the familiar. In this play the change from Appolinus to Pericles, Hellican to Helicanus, Artestrathes to Simonides, Strangulio to Clean, and Athenagoras to Lysimachus are in accord with his taste.

(2) Marina is in name the elder sister of Perdita, Fidele [Imogen] and Miranda; her name may well have been Shakspere's invention, replacing the "Thaise" of Gower which now is allotted to her mother. Lysimachus is given the name of the king in the anecdote from Barnabie Riche which is alluded to by Thaliard in a speech[35] which I ascribe to Shakspere.

(3) It may not be pushing ingenuity too far to suggest

[33] *Cf. Othello*, I, ii, 62ff.; I, iii, 60ff., 170.
[34] See below, pp. 83-85.
[35] I, iii, 3ff.

that in a few passages of verse in Acts I and II which have have not been recast by Shakspere there is metrical evidence of a substitution of names. "Appolinus" is a word of four syllables, with the accent on the second syllable; "Pericles" is shorter by the unaccented first syllable. In several instances there is a suggestion that an extra syllable had to be found because of the dropping of "Appolinus." In I. i. "young Prince of Tyre" occurs twice, "the prince of Tyre" once, and "Prince Pericles" four times, the repetition of this last formal title being particularly unnatural. In II, i, 132, "Keep it, my Pericles" may well replace "Keep it, Appolinus"; in II, iii, 81—"A gentleman of Tyre; my name, Pericles"—the meter would be improved by substituting Appolinus and making the line an Alexandrine.[36] The expansion of Gower's "Hellican" to Helicanus may also be Shaksperian, but in this case the short form "Helicane" is retained generally in Acts I and II, occurring, for instance, once in the prologue to Act II and four times in II, iv. The longer form occurs twice in these Acts, in a passage in I, ii, which I believe reworked by Shakspere; it is the only form of the name in Acts III-V. The other names provide no metrical clues.

It cannot be shown that Shakspere's changes in these two Acts were clearly motivated by a desire to strengthen the play as a whole. There was, indeed, little opportunity, except in the matter of characterization, if the original sequence of events was to be—as comparison with the source story shows that it has been—preserved. The figure of Pericles himself may have gained some additional warmth, but Cleon and Dionyza, the other principal characters that reappear in the later Acts, in Act I, Scene iv, are allowed to remain undifferentiated, purely elegiac forms. His purpose seems to have been mainly to brighten the episodes in an episodic narrative.

It is not to be expected that the foregoing partition of the play will commend itself throughout to all readers; and indeed it cannot fail to be incorrect in some degree. I am

[36]Thaisa's speech, ll. 86-89, repeating the biography of Pericles, uses the name metrically in a normal phrase, but the speech is obviously garbled.

satisfied, however, that the underlying assumptions are correct and hope in the main the details have been worked out reasonably. Some further support for my treatment of the problems of Acts I and II and of the choruses may perhaps be found in a subsequent discussion of the author of the pre-Shaksperian play.

I, 1, 5. "Think death no hazard in this enterprise." The sentiment is like Romeo's in *R. and J.*, II, ii, 76-84.

II. 12-40. Several critics, including Frank Harris and "Q," assign part or all of this passage to Shakspere, especially II. 12-14, 34-38. Shakspere was fond of the book-lover conceit; some of the phrases may perhaps be his; metrical fluidity appears in the run-on lines. On the other hand, the lyricism is pretty rather than strong, and the general movement of the passage is not obviously Shaksperian. I doubt if it is his in the main.

II. 91-108. This passage contains several phrases of more condensed force than is usual in Acts I and II. The "blind mole" sentence (II. 100-02) is particularly singled out as Shaksperian; standing out "in startling distinction from its context" (Chambers: *William Shakespeare*, I. 220). The general effect of the speech, however, is, like that of II. 12-40, a doubtfully Shaksperian lyricism. The imagery was used in *1 Tamburlaine*, II. vi, 1-4:

> "What means this devilish shepherd, to aspire
> With such giantly presumption,
> To cast up hills against the face of heaven,
> And dare the force of angry Jupiter?"

It may be of interest to note that in the same speech of King Cosroe appear the lines:

> "Some powers divine, or else infernal, mix'd
> Their angry seeds at his conception,"

reminiscent of the reference by Antiochus (II. 8-11) to the "senate-house of planets" presiding at the "conception" of his daughter; and, further, that both II. 12-40 and 91-108 have a slight flavor of Marlowe.

My guess is that Shakspere recast II. 98-108, and to some extent improved the movement of the whole speech. "Poor worm," as a term of commiseration, is applied by Prospero to Miranda in *Temp.*, III. i. 31. There are also some curious parallels of idea, phrase, and rhythm between this speech and two passages in *Timon of Athens*, the second certainly Shaksperian:

> "If our betters play at that game, we must not dare
> To imitate them; faults that are rich are fair!"
> (I, ii, 12-13).
>
> "Ah, when the means are gone that buy this praise,
> The breath is gone whereof this praise is made.
> Feast-won, fast-lost; one cloud of winter showers,
> These flies are couch'd." (II, ii, 178-81).

ll. 161-71. The conclusion of the scene is marked by briskness, vigor, run-on lines. This is probably Shakspere touching up to improve the move-

ment of the action. He may also have endowed Thaliard with the slightly humorous alacrity in murder which is further disclosed in Sc. iii. Thomas assigns to Shakspere ll. 150-71, but ll. 152-54 at any rate belong to the original author.

I. iii. The opening speech has in general a metrical and poetic character like the passages in Scene i discussed above. The most that can be argued for is a slight revision, with the introduction of a few condensed phrases.

II. 1. 5 may be revised. *Cf. M.N.D.,* I, i, 19: "The pale companion [melancholy] is not for our pomp." Also note that in *Macbeth,* III, ii, 19-20—"Of sorriest fancies your companions making. Using those thoughts . . . "companions" and "Using" stand together in the same senses as "companion" and "used" in *Pericles.*

ll. 13-15. The movement of the verse is stiff, but the verbal antitheses are like Shakspere's.

ll. 14-28. These lines have something of the movement and diction of Shaksperian verse. The personifications are like those in the unShaksperian passages in these Acts but seem a little more vivacious.

ll. 34-69. The dialogue with Helicanus begins mechanically; but at l. 48 the run-on lines begin to predominate and with the pretended anger of Pericles the talk becomes more natural and trenchant. Such exchanges as ll. 56-58 and 63-69 may be revisions. Malone compares Signior Sooth (I. 44) with Sir Smile of *W.T.,* I, ii, 196. There is no evidence of expansion of the scene as compared with mere touching-up.

I. iii. Thomas says: "I give this scene entire to Shakspere. The style is firmer and more natural . . ." With this judgment on the whole I agree, but believe the scene is a revision rather than a wholly new, interpolated scene. Lines 21-24 are a survival; but the speeches of Thaliard and such phrases as "unlicensed of your loves" have the stamp of Shakspere.

II. 13-14 have a Shaksperian turn of phrase.

I. iv. The first 55 lines of this scene seem untouched, but from the entry of the Lord to his exit there is less stiffness and there are probably two Shaksperian interpolations.

ll. 63-65 contains the first of these; compare the familiar parallels in *Hamlet, IV,* v, 78-79 and IV, vii, 164-65. Without this passage the speech of Cleon would run metrically:

"I thought as much. Some neighbor nation" . . .

l. 78 expresses a commonplace in terms very similar to the speech of Edgar in *Lear,* IV, i, 2-6.

II. i. For general remarks on this scene, which several critics have assigned to Shakspere, see above, p. —. More specifically, it may be suggested that the opening speech of Pericles is largely but not entirely rewritten from the old play; that the following dialogue up to line 106 has been almost wholly rewritten but may retain a few phrases from the original; that the rest of the scene retains much of the original, but at least ll. 15-38 and 148-52 are Shakspere's. Besides the parallel with the Hamlet-gravediggers dialogue which has been pointed to my several critics, there is a parallel also with

the scene between Valentine and the outlaws in *Two Gentlemen of Verona,* Act IV, Scene i; note especially Valentine's

> "Then know that I have little wealth to lose.
> A man I am cross'd with adversity;
> My riches are these poor habiliments . . ." (ll. 11-13).

II, ii. There is no clear evidence of the presence of Shakspere in this scene, but ll. 48-59 may be revised, especially ll. 56-57.

II, iii, See the general comment above. Thomas assigns the scene as a whole to Shakspere, but I disagree. Lines 17-18 are Shakspere's, and perhaps ll. 15, 16, and 19 have been retouched.

II, iv. Inference is unsafe regarding this badly garbled scene, but it is suggested that Shakspere retouched ll. 17-22 and is responsible for ll. 41-42 and 48.

II, v. See the general comment above. The scene has been extensively revised, almost rewritten, by Shakspere. The situation, including the waggery of Simonides, to which some critics take violent exception, was probably taken over from the original without much change. Lines 2-6, 14-23, and 73-88 either are corrupt or were only slightly revised.

Metrical evidence, it has repeatedly and rightly been said, is peculiarly unreliable for *Pericles.* Nevertheless it is interesting to note that Act I, Scene iv, which seems more free from corruptions and from revisions than any comparable passage in these Acts, has a high percentage of rhyme (27%), and low percentages of feminine endings (10%), and of run-on lines (8%). Act II seems to have had more attention from Shakspere than Act I, and the averages for the whole Act are: rhyme, 21%; feminine endings, 17%; run-on lines, 14%. Act II, Scene v, for which I argued a revision almost amounting to rewriting, has a lower percentage of rhyme (15%) than any other scene of these Acts. But the situation from scene to scene varies so much, the figures in most cases are so much the result of multiple contamination, that even the above very general and incomplete corroboration of the guesses on literary grounds is of slight value.

Brown University.

THE FENCING BOUT IN *HAMLET*

By SELMA GUTTMAN

MANY attempts have been made to discover exactly how the fencing bout in *Hamlet* (V, ii) would have been presented before an Elizabethan audience. The critics are of two opinions regarding the weapons used. Stage Hamlets ordinarily fence with single rapier and gauntlet, but a few actors, as for example, H. B. Irving,[1] and more recently, John Gielgud and Maurice Evans, have used a left hand dagger as well. Recent criticism, led by Dr. John Dover Wilson,[2] tends to approve the latter usage although little new data have been added to support this practice. To determine Shakspere's intention in the matter one must analyze the text of *Hamlet* in detail and must consider it in historical perspective. Hitherto neither of these lines of study has been pursued carefully. It seems advisable, therefore, to consider the problem by dealing in turn with the Elizabethan background, the evidence in *Hamlet* supporting the rapier-and-dagger theory, and the evidence in *Hamlet* supporting the single rapier theory. Such a study will show that in this contest the fencers should be armed with only one weapon—the rapier.

I.

The weapons used in private quarrels during the age of Shakspere were many and varied. A black-letter tract of 1615 offers the following list:

> "In this city [London] there be manie professors of the science of defence, and very skilful men in teaching the best and most offensive and defensive use of verie many weapons, as of the long-sword, back-sword, rapier and dagger, single rapier, the case of rapiers, the sword and buckler, or targate, the pike, the halberd, the long-staff, and others."[3]

---

[1] E. M. A., "The Duel in *Hamlet*," *TLS*, Oct. 16, 1919, p. 572.

[2] J. D. Wilson, "Introduction" to G. Silver's *Paradoxes of Defence, 1599*, Shakespeare Assoc. Facsimiles, no. 6, Ln., 1933.—"The Hero at Bay," in *What Happens in Hamlet* (N. Y., Cambridge, 1935), pp. 276-279.—*Hamlet*, ed. by J. D. Wilson (Cambridge, 1934), *passim*.

[3] Joseph Strutt, *The Sports and Pastimes of the People of England* (Ln., 1845), bk. III, ch. VI, pp. 261-62. For additional lists, *cf.* Alfred Hutton, *The Sword and the Centuries*, with introductory remarks by Capt. C. G. R. Matthey (1901), p. 285; Randle Holme, *An Academie or Store House of Armory and Blazon* (Ln., 1905), bk. III, ch. XIX, p. 161, col. 1.

Of these, only the single rapier or the rapier-and-dagger could have been employed in the *Hamlet* bout.

Single rapier play was a refinement of the earlier sword-and-buckler combat. The rapier was much longer and narrower than the sword.[4] Emphasis was placed upon thrusts executed with the point of the weapon rather than with the edge. Thrusts were parried by a left-hand gauntlet,[5] which supplanted the buckler or shield.

In rapier-and-dagger combat a dagger performed the defensive function of the gauntlet.

> "Left hand [gauntleted], left-hand dagger, left-hand sword, or cloak, were all used for the same purpose; to beat aside, or to ensnare, if possible, the adverse rapier. Even Saviolo,[6] as early as 1595, makes little distinction between them."[7]

The special significance of the dagger, however, lay in that it also served as an additional weapon of attack.[8] Silver stresses the dangerous possibilities of the dagger in rapier-and-dagger combat: "then presently followeth (vnlesse it please God otherwise to haue it) the stabs with their daggers, wherein there lieth no defence."[9] Accounts of actual duels show that the dagger, with its sharp point and two sharp edges, was an extremely dangerous auxiliary weapon. An example of its deadly effectiveness may be cited from the report of a duel which took place in 1609:

> "They attacked each other, each armed with a rapier and a dagger.

---

[4]The rapier became so long as to result in a proclamation issued in the Queen's name "to place selected grave citizens at every gate to . . . break the rapiers' points of all passengers that exceedeth a yard in length."

[5]"A glove worn as part of mediæval armour, usually made of leather, covered with plates of steel." *NED.*

[6]Vincentio Saviolo, *His Practise. In two Bookes. The first intreating of the use of the Rapier and Dagger. The second, of Honor and honorable Quarrels* (Ln., 1595), sig. 1 3v: "As farre as I can perceiue, the rules of the single rapier, and of Rapier and Dagger, are al one."

[7]Lee Mitchell, "The Fencing Scene in *Hamlet*," *Philological Quarterly*, 16: 71-73, Jan., 1937.

[8]Saviolo stresses the defensive use of the dagger because he is considering school fencing rather than actual duelling. He repeatedly emphasizes the difference between the two. Yet even in his manual of practice, Saviolo refers to stabbing with daggers: "You may giue him a riuersa uppon his legge with your Rapier, and stabbe him with your dagger in the bodie." "Your enemie entering maye thrust you in the bellie with his Rapier, and giue you a stabbe with his Dagger besides." Saviolo, *op. cit.*, sig. I3 and I3v.

[9]Silver, *op. cit.*, p. 49.

> In the first onset, Cheek ran Dutton through the throat with his dagger, close to the windpipe; when Dutton made a pass at him and ran him through the body, while he stabbed him in the back with his poignard."[10]

Saviolo admonishes pupil and master to exercise caution even in practice bouts in which the dagger was employed, since:

> "the maister often putteth him self in danger . . . and therefore the maister must be respectiue two waies: in sauing him selfe, and not hurting his scholler."[11]

It is for this reason, probably, that Gaiani says:

> "Das Spiel mit dem Dolche [accompanying the rapier] ist nur für den Ernstkampf[12] anzurathen; diese Waffen eignen sich weniger für die Schule und unter Freunden".[13]

Additional evidence to prove that rapier-and-dagger was employed almost exclusively in serious matches is furnished by the record of a conversation preceding a French duel:

> "D'Entragues had a dagger besides his sword. Quelus had none. As they were beginning their attack, Quelus observed to him, 'You have a dagger, and I have not.' To which he repied. 'You have done an idle thing in leaving it at home. Are we not met to fight seriously, and not for an ostentatious tilting-match?"[14]

Not only did the dagger increase the danger of the attack, but, being smaller, it lent itself to insidious and treacherous practices. One museum catalogue describes a sixteenth century dagger with grooves that may have served to conceal poison.[15] Saint Victor, describing another collection of weapons, notes:

---

[10]Andrew Steinmetz, *The Romance of Duelling in all Times and Countries* (Ln., 1868), v. I, pp. 173ff. For additional examples, *cf. ibid, passim;* Hutton, *op. cit., passim;* Pierre de Bourdeille, Seigneur de Brantôme, *Oeuvres Complètes* (Paris, 1873), *tome* 6, *passim.*

[11]Saviolo, *op. cit.,* sig. F4v.

[12]The frontispiece of *Annalia Dubrensia* (*cf.* footnote 22) portrays two men engaged in rapier-and-dagger combat. The text does not refer to this sport but alludes to the simulation of dangerous combat and to the use of bated weapons. Such usage has no relevance to the *Hamlet* match. No attempt is made in *Hamlet* to simulate dangerous combat. There is no foundation whatsoever for the suggestion that in *Hamlet* the daggers—if such were used—were bated. *Cf.* p. 96.

[13]Alfiero Gio. Battista Gaiani, *Arte di maneggiar la Spada a piedi, et a cavallo, Loana,* 1619; Gaiani, *Discorso del Tornear A piedi, Genova,* 1619; summarized in Gustav Hergsell, *Die Fechtkunst im XV. und XVI. Jahrhunderte* (Prag, 1896), p. 407.

[14]*The History of Duelling in Two Parts containing the Origin, Progress, Revolutions, and Present State of Duelling in France and England* (Ln., 1770), pp. 69-70. *Cf.* also Brantôme, *op. cit.,* pp. 312-14.

[15]Bashford Dean, *The Metropolitan Museum of Art Handbook of Arms and Armour, European and Oriental* (N. Y., 1915), p. 75.

> "Au XVIe siècle, la dague . . . devient une arme de duel, terrible et perfide . . . Quelquefois la dague, nue en apparence, recélait en elle un trident; deux petites lames latérales, faisant corps avec celle du milieu, bifurquaient, sous la pression d'un ressort caché dans le talon. C' était la vipère lançant son triple dard. Le musée montre un curieux spécimen de ce stylet à surprise."[16]

Rapier-and-dagger combat was in use in England before Shakspere began writing. According to tradition, Rowland Yorke introduced rapier play into England in 1587,[17] but the rapier and the dagger were popular before this date. Castle, an authority on the subject, says: "The rapier, in fact, came in with the taste for 'cavaliero' style, and may be looked upon as its first outward symbol already in the days of Queen Mary."[18] Sir Humphrey Gilbert, in *Queene Elizabethes Achademy,* written about 1570, recommends a master of defence "who shalbe principally expert in the Rapier and dagger, the Sworde and tergat, the gripe of the dagger, the battaile axe and the pike."[19] In 1583 *The Chronicle of the Corporation of the Masters of Defence* records the award of a Master's Prize to Willyam Mathewes for proficiency in "the longe sworde the back sworde the sworde and buckeler and the rapier and dagger."[20]

Authorities agree that the rapier remained in use in England until the middle of the seventeenth century. Wilson apparently errs in stating that "the custom of employing daggers in fence had gone out . . . certainly . . . by 1623, when the Folio was printed."[21] Rapier-and-dagger fence must have remained in use at least until 1638 when *Annalia Dubrensia* was published. Its frontispiece (reproduced in this issue) pictures the various activities engaged in during the Cotswald Games. In its upper right hand corner two

[16]Paul de St. Victor, "Le Musée d'Artillerie," *Anciens et Modernes* (Paris, 1886), pp. 79-80.

[17]A. F. Sieveking, editor, *Worke for Cvtlers or a Merry Dialogue betweene Sword, Rapier and Dagger, Acted in a Shew in . . . Cambridge, A. D. 1615* (Ln., 1904), pp. 26-27.

[18]Egerton Castle, "Swordsmanship Considered Historically and as a Sport," *Living Age,* series 7, 24: 801, June, 1904.

[19]Sir Humphrey Gilbert, *Queene Elizabethes Achademy,* ed. by F. J. Furnivall (Ln., 1869), p. 7. Sir H. Ellis, *Archeologica,* 21: 506, gives date cited.

[20]Alfred Hutton, *op. cit.,* p. 277.

[21]Wilson, "Introduction," *Paradoxes of Defence,* p. xviii.

men play at rapier-and-dagger.[22] Surely, illustration of this exercise would not have been included in the frontispiece of this book if the dagger had gone out of use fifteen years before! Alfred Hutton states that the rapier had been discarded by the reign of Charles II, but he notes the retention of the dagger as an auxiliary weapon. "Backsword [was] used either 'single' or accompanied by the great gauntlet or by a basket hilted dagger" during the Restoration period.[23] Wilson's misconception may be explained by his confusion concerning the early fencing reforms, which affected the longer rather than the auxiliary weapon. The dagger served as a possible additional weapon not only with the rapier but also with the older type of sword and with the short sword of the seventeenth century.[24]

During this period was rapier-and-dagger preferred to the single rapier? Wilson, answering the question in the affirmative, offers as his sole piece of evidence an engraving of the city of London, made by John Norden in 1600. In it two men are pictured fencing with rapier-and-dagger.[25] Surely, this does not constitute proof of the greater popularity of rapier-and-dagger. It merely shows that the latter form of fence was in existence in 1600, a fact that has been proved above. To determine the relative popularity of the two forms of fence, one must turn to contemporary literature. In practically every sixteenth century fencing treatise, the discussion of single rapier precedes that of rapier-and-dagger because

> "Man muss von dem Grundsatze durchdrungen sein, dass der Degen die Königin unter den Waffen ist und die Grundlage für die

[22] A. B. Grosart, editor, *Annalia Dubrensia or Celebration of Capt. Robert Dover's Cotswald Games,* Manchester, 1877. I am indebted to Dr. S. A. Tannenbaum for calling my attention to this illustration.

[23] Hutton, *op. cit.,* p. 286. For the use of the dagger on the continent during the 1620's, *cf.* the accounts of the French duel of Beuvron and Boutteville, 1627, in Hutton, *op. cit.,* p. 169; and *The History of Duelling in Two Parts, containing the Origin, Progress, Revolutions, and Present State of Duelling in France and England* (Ln., 1770), p. 83. For rapier-and-dagger treatises written or republished on the continent during the 1620's, *cf.* Hergsell, *op. cit.,* pp. 308, 293.

[24] An illustration depicting "a guard for the short sword and dagger to encounter against the long Rapier and Dagger or else the long sword and Dagger" is found in Joseph Swetnam's *The Schoole of the Noble and Worthy Science of Defence,* Ln., 1617. Reprinted in *Shakespeare's England* (Oxford, 1917), v. II, p. 396.

[25] Wilson, *What Happens in Hamlet,* p. 280; *Hamlet,* ed. by Wilson, pp. 250-51.

Führung aller übrigen Waffen bildet."[26]

Saviolo, proponent of rapier-and-dagger combat, acknowledges the greater popularity of single rapier:

> "I will first shew you how this ward is good, either to offend or defend, and cheefelye with the single Swoorde and the gloue, *which is most in use among Gentlemen.*"[27]

A study of Elizabethan plays has not yielded us a single example of a rapier-and-dagger combat which was intended for stage performance.[28] This testifies either to the danger of this form of combat or to the greater popularity of the single sword or rapier.

In many Shaksperian and non-Shaksperian plays attacks on the use of rapier-and-dagger are incorporated in the dialogue. In *The Two Angry Women of Abington,* for example, the following observation is made:

> "If . . . this poking fight of rapier and dagger will come vp then, then a man, a tall man, & a good sword and buckler man, will be spitted like a Cat or a cunney, then a boy will be as good as a man, vnlesse the Lord shew mercie vnto vs, well, I had as lieue be hanged as liue to see that day."[29]

In *The Return from Parnassus,* Ingenioso rails against a *miles gloriosus:*

> "Why, who coulde endure this post put into a sattin sute, this haberdasher of lyes, this bracchidochio, this ladyemunger, this meere rapier and dagger, this cringer . . ."[30]

In Shakspere, it is the ridiculous braggart, Slender, who boasts of having played "at sword and dagger with a master of fence; three veneys for a dish of stewed prunes."[31] In *Measure for Measure,* Pompey includes "Master Starve-lackey the rapier and dagger man" in a list of criminals.[32] The only reference in the dialogue of *Hamlet* to rapier-and-dagger is made by the officious, foolish Osric.[33]

---

[26]Ridolpho Capo Ferro da Cagli, *Gran simulacro dell'arte a dell 'uso della Scherma,* Siena, 1610. Summarized in Hergsell, *op. cit.,* p. 384.

[27]Saviolo, *op. cit.,* sig. F 3v. [Our italics].

[28]The only possible exception is *Hamlet.*

[29]Henry Porter, *The Pleasant History of the Two Angry Women of Abington* (Ln., 1599), sig. E 3v.

[30]W. D. Macray, editor, *The Pilgrimage to Parnassus with the Two Parts of the Return from Parnassus . . . performed . . . 1597-1601* (Oxford, 1886), Part I, IV, i, p. 64.

[31]*The Merry Wives of Windsor,* I, i, 296-98. Except in the case of *Hamlet,* all line references to Shaksperian plays are based upon *The Oxford Shakespeare,* edited by W. J. Craig, Oxford, 1919.

[32]*Measure for Measure,* IV, iii, 15.

[33]*Hamlet,* ed. by Wilson, V, ii, 148.

Shakspere, like other Elizabethan writers, also attacks duelling in general. In *Henry Sixth, Part Two,* a mock duel is used for comic relief.[34] In the *First Part of Henry Fourth,* fencing terms are used for vilification: "You vile standing-tuck," "Sword-and-buckler Prince."[35] Touchstone's analysis of lies[36] satirizes such sophistries as may be found in the second book of Saviolo's *Practice. Twelfth Night* contains two skirmishes, one, a serio-comic duel.[37] *Romeo and Juliet* is a veritable sermon against duelling. It is usually inadvisable to attribute any of the points of view of Shaksperian characters to the dramatist, himself, but the consistently hostile attitude toward private combat and rapier-and-dagger fence, in plays ranging from about 1592 to 1604, probably reflects Shakspere's own disapproval.

II.

In the problematic *Bestrafte Brudermord*[38] the bout is unquestionably played with a single weapon. There is no reference to the use of a dagger.

In the highly unreliable first quarto of *Hamlet,* the Gentleman [Osric] answers Hamlet's query, "And howe's the wager?" with

> "Mary sir, that yong Leartes in twelue venies
> At Rapier and Dagger do not get three oddes of you."[39]

To this testimony little weight can be given. Some of the supporters of the rapier-and-dagger theory do not stress, and others do not even mention, the challenge in the first quarto. They appreciate the weakness of any conclusions based upon this corrupt text.[40] One might as easily draw the conclusion that daggers were not used because they are not mentioned in the *Bestrafte Brudermord.* Accord-

[34] *2 Henry VI,* I, iii, and II, iii.
[35] *1 Henry IV,* iv, 277-78; and I, iii, 230.
[36] *As You Like It,* V, iv, 48 *ff.*
[37] *Twelfth Night,* III, iv; and IV, i.
[38] Whether *Der Bestrafte Brudermord* is a corrupt version of Shakspere's play or of the *Ur-Hamlet* is a moot question. For bibliography *cf.* A. A. Raven, *A Hamlet Bibliography and Reference Guide* (Chicago, 1936), pp. 120-28.
[39] Shakespeare, *Hamlet, The First Quarto, 1603,* facsimile, from the copy in the H. E. Huntington Library (Cambridge, 1931), sig. I 2v.
[40] According to some scholars, quarto one is a truncated version of the *Ur-Hamlet* rather than of Shakspere's *Hamlet. Cf.* Raven, *op. cit.,* pp. 128-144.

ing to Mr. E. B. Goodacre, the stage-direction in the first quarto, V, ii (*"They catch one anothers Rapiers"*[41]) clearly implies that each combatant actually grasps the weapon of the other, a procedure which would be possible only in single-weapon fence.[42]

In the second quarto, a version supposed by some to be based on Shakspere's own manuscript, the courtier [Osric] praises Laertes' excellence at fence, as follows:

> *"Cour.* I meane sir for this weapon, but in the imputation laide on him, by them in his meed, hee's vnfellowed.
> *Ham.* What's his weapon?
> *Cour.* Rapier and Dagger.
> *Ham.* That's two of his weapons, but well."[43]

The first folio reads:

> *"Osr.* Sir, you are not ignorant of what excellence *Laertes* is at his weapon.
> *Ham.* What's his weapon?
> *Osr.* Rapier and dagger.
> *Ham.* That's two of his weapons; but well."[44]

Regarding this repartee Goodacre queries: "But may not this be a jest purely and simply, made and forgotten, perhaps retained for the sake of the jest from the *Ur-Hamlet,* and of no significance as regards the succeeding match?"[45] Whether the lines were derived from the *Ur-Hamlet* or whether they were consciously inserted by Shakspere, their intention is humorous. The lines serve as the high point in Shakspere's satiric delineation of the silly, affected Osric, the fop to whom the weather is "sultry hot" or "indifferent cold," according to the whim of his listener. Both Hamlet and Osric have been speaking of Laertes' weapon. "What's his weapon?" Hamlet asks. In a trice Osric's "weapon" becomes two weapons. Osric's addition of the dagger to the rapier serves to illustrate both his affectation and his ignorance. A true connoisseur of the noble art of defence, one who had read Saviolo and other masters, would have

---

[41]*Hamlet,* first quarto, *op. cit.,* sig. I 3v.
[42]E. B. Goodacre, "The Duel in *Hamlet, TLS,* Jan. 11, 1934, p. 28.
[43]Shakespeare, *Hamlet, The Second Quarto, 1604,* Reproduced in facsimile from the copy in the Huntington Library, with an introduction by O. J. Campbell (San Marino, Cal., 1938), sig. N 2v.
[44]*Mr. William Shakespeares Comedies, Histories, & Tragedies, published according to the True Original Copies* (Ln., 1623) [first folio edition], Tragedies, p. 280, col. 1.
[45]Goodacre, "The Duel in *Hamlet," TLS,* Feb. 8, 1934, p. 92.

been aware that the single rapier was the queen of weapons, that the single weapon was generally preferred by gentlemen because it represented the art in its purest form. Hamlet calls the audience's attention to Osric's foolishness by saying, "That's two of his weapons; but, well." In the theatre this gets a laugh.

In the Folio text a stage-direction in V, ii, specifies that the bout is to be played with rapiers and gauntlets. The parallel stage-direction of the second quarto specifies rapiers and daggers as the weapons to be used. Which stage-direction is the more reliable? The chaotic order of the details in the second quarto version suggests some error or revision:

> *"A table prepared, Trumpets, Drums and officers with Cushion, King, Queene, and all the state, Foiles, daggers, and Laertes."*[46]

The Folio arrangement is far more logical:

> *"Enter King, Queene, Laertes and Lords, with other Attendants with Foyles, and Gauntlets, a Table and Flagons of wine on it."*[47]

Moreover, according to Wilson and others, the first Folio text was based on a prompt-copy, and the second quarto on some other manuscript, perhaps upon Shakspere's holograph. The Folio version, based upon the prompt-copy, is more likely to present the actual stage practise of Shakspere's company. That the second quarto is not as dependable as the first Folio, at least in V, ii, may also be deduced from the omission, in the second quarto, of the essential stage-direction regarding the exchange of weapons—a stage-direction which is present in the first quarto, the first Folio, and in the *Bestrafte Brudermord*.

"Daggers [in the second quarto stage-direction] may unwittingly have been retained from *Ur-Hamlet* and [have been] overlooked in the final revision."[48] On the other hand, the compositor of the second quarto, whom Wilson calls "scoundrelly,"[49] may have inserted the word "dagger" in the stage-direction. This insertion may have been caused either by the influence of the "dagger" in the challenge of

[46] *Hamlet*, second quarto, sig. N 3v.
[47] *Hamlet*, first folio, Tragedies, p. 280, col. 2.
[48] Goodacre. "The Duel in *Hamlet*," *TLS*, Jan. 11, 1934, p. 28
[49] Wilson, "Introduction," *Paradoxes of Defence*, p. xvii.

the first quarto, or by the influence of Osric's "rapier and dagger," which appears less than one hundred lines before the stage-direction of the second quarto. Such a possibility is supported by Wilson's description of the printing of the second quarto:

> "However perfect the copy, the printing of the Second Quarto was far from being so, the compositor's worst fault being the omission of words, phrases . . . His departures from Shakespeare were both complicated and obscured by an overlooker who took upon him to correct without reference to the manuscript copy, such sins of omissions and commissions as he detected or imagined he detected. Thus . . . no editor can afford to neglect the First Folio."[50]

Wilson explains away the absence of "daggers" from the first Folio stage-direction by suggesting that "the custom of employing daggers in fence had gone out . . . certainly . . . by 1623, when the Folio was printed."[51] We have already shown that in this he is in error.

The remaining argument offered by Wilson to support the rapier-and-dagger theory is invalid. According to him, rapier-and-dagger fence had not come into favor until 1590; at the turn of the century it was preferred above all other types; when *Hamlet* was written, Shakspere, formerly disapproving of fencing, had been won over to the new rapier-and-dagger fad. But, as we have seen, rapier-and-dagger fence was employed in England before 1590; there is no reason for believing that rapier-and-dagger combat was preferred above other forms at the turn of the century. Shakspere's attitude, moreover, was consistently opposed to private combat both before and after *Hamlet* was written.[52]

III

Confusion concerning the nature of the match between Hamlet and Laertes has resulted from the uncritical tendency of commentators to call it "The Duel in *Hamlet*." Strictly speaking, however, there is no duel in the play. The match is ostensibly only a friendly athletic contest, a

[50] *Hamlet*, ed. by Wilson, pp. xxvii-xxviii.
[51] *Ibid.*, p. xviii.
[52] *Cf.*, pp. 89-92.

"sportful combat." A duel is the outcome of a formal challenge by an aggrieved party. No such challenge is made by Laertes; the encounter appears to be the result merely of the King's whim to see who is the better fencer—hence, the wager. In a duel dangerous weapons are used. In *Hamlet,* however, the foils are supposed to be harmless; Laertes' use of a "sharp" is an act of treachery, as he, himself, confesses. The adversaries in a duel strive to wound or to kill each other, whereas in *Hamlet* one of the contestants seeks merely to win a wager by scoring the greater number of "hits." Horatio, it will be remembered, is astonished that the combatants bleed. Furthermore, spectators of a duel were obliged to remain silent upon pain of serious punishment or death,[53] since speech might fatally distract the attention of the duellists whose lives were in the balance. The spectators in *Hamlet* converse freely during the contest. Hamlet's "I . . . will this brother's wager frankly play"[54] clearly characterizes the amicable nature of the encounter.

IV

Such a "brother's wager" would not be played with bare daggers added to harmless foils. The spectators would have considered the additional offensive threat of the dagger dangerous and unnecessary. They would have known that the defensive operations of the dagger could be as satisfactorily performed by the gauntleted left hand. Wilson, to be sure, says that "the daggers . . . of course were all bated,"[55] but his statement is an unfounded assumption for which there is no textual evidence.[56]

Furthermore, in Shakspere's day, single rapier fence was considered the more perfect form, the form favored by gentlemen.[57] It would, therefore, have been the more fitting

[53]Randle Holme, *op. cit.,* bk. III, ch. XIX, pp. 174-75; Andrew Favine, *The Theatre of Honour and Knight-hood* (Ln., 1623), bk. X, ch. IV, pp. 442, 459; Iohn Ferne, compiler, *The Blazon of Gentrie* (Ln., 1586), p. 330.

[54]*Hamlet,* ed. by Wilson, V, ii, 250-51.

[55]Wilson, *What Happens in Hamlet,* p. 281.

[56]Shakspere, wishing his audience to know that the rapiers should be dull, calls them "foils." Foils are blunt weapons: "Blunt as the fencer's foils, which hit, but hurt not." (*Much Ado About Nothing,* V, ii, 13-14) There is, however, nowhere in *Hamlet* any indication that daggers (if such are intended) are dulled.

[57]*Cf.,* p. 91.

form for a demonstration of grace and skill, especially when one of the contestants is a prince.

A more important argument for the use of the single rapier is that in this type of sword-play the exchange of weapons demanded by the action could easily have been effected. The German fencer, Egenolphs, and the French Saincte Didier describe weapon exchanges in single rapier fence.[58] As the result of crossing their weapons, the antagonists come into close quarters. With his gauntleted left hand, each seizes and wrests away his opponent's rapier. Such disarming would be impossible if the left hand held a dagger. According to Wilson, "Sig. Bb 1 *verso* of the *True Arte* of Di Grassi contains a careful explanation of how in rapier and dagger play one may jerk the sword out of an opponent's hand by using one's own sword as a lever and striking his sword sharply with the dagger in the left hand. Unless the sword-lever is applied well past the middle of the other sword, the device will hardly work."[59] Wilson notes, however, that such an exchange was rarely used. Mr. Evan John, therefore, suggests that Hamlet drop his rapier, and, defending himself with his dagger, seize Laertes' weapon.[60] Such a suggestion is tantamount to an admission that the match could not be performed with all four weapons.

However the disarming is executed in rapier-and-dagger fence, at least one weapon must drop to the ground, since one man cannot fence with three weapons at one time. But one of the rules promulgated for a typical Triumph before Henry VIII states: "He that his sword falleth out of his hand, shall winne no prize."[61] A similar statement is found

[58]Hergsell, *op. cit.*, pp. 468, 195-97.

[59]Wilson, "Introduction," *Paradoxes of Defence*, p. xix. Di Grassi's work was unavailable for consultation.

[60]Evan John, "The Duel in *Hamlet*," *TLS*, Jan. 25, 1934, p. 60. According to Gielgud and Evans, Hamlet drops his dagger when Laertes attacks him off guard. In Evans's reconstruction, Hamlet knocks Laertes' dagger out of his hand and seizes Laertes' rapier. According to Gielgud, Laertes throws his dagger away. Such an action on the part of Laertes would be extremely foolhardy. *Cf.* Rosamond Gilder, *John Gielgud's Hamlet* (N. Y., 1937), pp. 227-29.

[61]W. Segar, *Honor Military and Ciuill, contained in foure Bookes* (Ln., 1602), bk. III, ch. 13, pp. 192-93.

in the rules of Tiptofte which Elizabeth ordered republished.[62] Segar in 1602 notes that, although a serious duel is not necessarily ended by the dropping of a weapon, "Most certaine it is, that in all Combats and actions, for honor, loue, and praise onely, whosoeuer loseth his sword,[63] must presently also lose the honor and victory."[64] If, then, rapier-and-dagger was employed in the match in *Hamlet,* Shakspere was breaking a traditional rule of such exhibition matches. That he intended to do this in *Hamlet* is highly improbable.

A careful examination of the text furnishes additional evidence that Shakspere intended the contest to be played with single rapier. When the King and Laertes plan the treacherous bout (IV, vii), their only references to weapons are to "your rapier," to "foils," "a sword unbated," and "my sword."[65] No weapon mentioned in the scene refers to a dagger. Yet in this scene the King and Laertes are considering every possible means of achieving their wicked purpose. They plan to employ a sharpened weapon and to poison the point of that weapon in what is to appear as merely a friendly match. If by some mischance Hamlet escape this sharpened and poisoned weapon, a poisoned drink awaits him. It is imperative that Hamlet's death be assured. "If this should fail . . . 'twere better not assayed."[66] Every undetectable means of assuring Hamlet death is acceptable. Why, then, should the plotters have ignored the

[62]John, Lord Tiptofte, *The Ordinances, Statutes, and Rules, made . . . and commanded . . . . to bee observed or kept in all manner of Justes of Peaces Royall,* reprinted in Sir John Harington, *et. al., Nugae Antiquae,* ed. by Thomas Park (London, 1804), I, p. 6.

[63]"Sword" appears to be used generically to refer to any weapon.

[64]W. Segar, *op. cit.,* p. 129.

[65]"Rapier" has been defined above as a type of sword with an extremly long blade. "The 'foil' for fence was . . . the kind of sword used in duelling, though with its edge and point blunted or 'bated.'" *Hamlet,* ed. by Wilson, p. 251. Similar definitions are to be found in Castle, *Schools and Masters of Fence* (Ln., 1892), p. 119; and Hergsell, *op. cit.,* p. 232. It is of interest to note that in V, ii, Hamlet asks for "foils." "Come, *one* for me," Laertes responds. Were "foil" intended to be used generically to include "dagger," Laertes' request could not have been couched in the singular. A Q2 stage direction, V, ii, moreover, reads "enter . . . with . . . foils, daggers." If the word, "foil" was to include "dagger," there would have been no need to mention the latter.

"Sword" has a generic use which includes "rapier" as well as the sword proper.

[66]*Hamlet,* ed. by Wilson, IV, vii, 149-151.

possibility of dispatching him by means of the dagger, especially if, as the King thinks, Laertes is the better fencer? This neglect can be explained in only one way: Shakspere intended the match to be played with rapiers only.

Goodacre notes that "there seems to be no choice of daggers" in V, ii. Only "foils" are mentioned.[67] If a dagger were to be used in addition to the foil, why do Hamlet and Laertes not ask for one?

> "*Hamlet.* Give us the *foils.*
> *Laertes.* Come, *one* for me." (V, ii, 252-53).

The King, too, makes no mention of a dagger. He asks only that the foils be given the contestants. Why, moreover, does Hamlet merely inquire whether "These foils[68] have all a length?"[69] The length of the dagger was just as important, for we are told by Silver,

> "All manner weapons vnder the iust length of the short Sword, as . . . Daggers, and such like short weapons of imperfect lengthes, the longest haue the aduantage."[70]

Because of its relative shortness, the slightest deviation in the length of the dagger would be important. Contemporary documents testify both to the fact that daggers varied in length, and to the fact that it was customary to measure daggers as well as rapiers before a combat to insure "equal size and weight."[71]

In the *Hamlet* bout there is no reference to a wound inflicted by a dagger; but if a dagger had been used in this match, an attack with it would have been practically inevi-

[67]Goodacre, "The Duel in *Hamlet*," *TLS*, Feb. 8, 1934, p. 92.

[68]*Cf.* ftnotes 56 and 65 for a definition of "foil."

[69]*Hamlet*, ed. by Wilson, V, ii, 264.

[70]Silver, *op. cit.*, p. 43.

[71]"In a letter dated 28th April, 1580, from William, Lord Burleigh, to the Lord Mayor, we read how 'He had caused search to be made among the Cutlers in Westminster for swords and daggers exceeding the length limited by her Majesty's Proclamation . . . the Cutlers had excused themselves, alleging that others of the same trade in London sold both swords and daggers exceeding the length prescribed.'" A. F. Sieveking, editor, *Workes for Cutlers*, p. 22. *Cf.* also *ibid.*, p. 27. For references to the measuring of daggers, *cf.* Hutton, *op. cit.*, pp. 106, 145; W. S. Davis, *Life in Elizabethan Days* (Ln., 1930), p. 308. A single instance was found in which a challenge (in 1609) specified the length of rapier alone: "And to that end have I sent you the length of my rapier, which I will use with a dagger, and so meet you at the farther end of Islington." Reprinted at Steinmetz, *op. cit.*, v. I., pp. 170-73.

table. The King's order: "Part them, they are incensed," shows that the contestants are at close quarters at least once during the match. When the combatants close, says Silver, "It is impossible to vncrosse, or get out, or auoide the stabbes of the Daggers."[72] Goodacre suggests that stabbing with the dagger may have been contrary to the rules of the friendly bout,[73] but in this case the opponents are "incensed" and one of them is not interested in following rules. Wilson attempts to evade the problem by saying that "the daggers . . . of course were all bated,"[74] but this statement, as has been noted above, is unfounded.[75]

Sharp or blunt, daggers are not called for; they serve no dramatic purpose either in IV, vii, or in the combat itself. On the other hand, the evidence presented in this paper warrants the conclusion that Shakspere's "brother's wager" was conceived as a fencing bout with foils alone.

[72]Silver, *op. cit.*, p. 9 and *passim.*
[73]Goodacre, "The Duel in *Hamlet*," *TLS*, Feb. 8, 1934, p. 92.
[74]Wilson, *What Happens in Hamlet*, p. 281.
[75]*Cf.*, p. 96.

I gratefully acknowledge my indebtedness to Prof. O. J. Campbell for much invaluable advice, and to Dr. S. A. Tannenbaum for many helpful suggestions and for the use of his library.

Curtis Scholar, Columbia University
New York.

INDEX OF NAMES AND SUBJECTS

Occurring in the Bibliography of Elizabethan Topics Published in 1938*

Compiled by R. W. BABCOCK

*Topics are printed in italics. Women's names are distinguished by a colon after the baptismal name. The bibliography covered by this Index was published in the January, 1939, issue of this *Bulletin*. Titles of books are in italics and in single quotes. Sh = Shakspere; Shn = Shaksperian.

A

Abbot, C. G., 10401
Ackermann, E., 10630
Actors, 10389-10397, 10623, 10979a
Adams, J. C. 10877
Adams, J. Q., 10882
Aesthetics, 10909
Alexander, P., 10765
Allen, D. C., 10511, 10535, 10582, 10596, 10637, 10897, 10959
Allen, J. W., 10597
Allen, N. B., 10783, 10842
Allen, P. S., 10603
'All's Well', 10735
Allusions, 10398, 10511
'Antony and Cleopatra', 10736-38, 10906, 10945
Apocrypha, 10399
Ardagh, J., 10641
Armstrong, M:, 10394
Arns, K., 10627
Art, Principles of, 10909
As You Like It, 10674, 10739
'Astronomical Thought in Renaissance England', 10400
Astronomy, 10400, 10841
Atkinson, B., 10781, 10839
Atkinson, D: F., 10956
Autographs, 10402, 10403, 10617
Avery, E. L., 10808

B

B., G., 10825
Babcock, R. W., 10433
'Backstage with Actors', 10392
Bacon, Francis, 10405-15
Bacon-Shakspere Question, 10416-22, 10706, 10883
Bakeless, J., 10588, 10686, 10689
Baker, H. K., 10409, 10420, 10776, 10865, 10892
Baker, O., 10442
Bald, R. C., 10522, 10550
Baldensperger, F., 10847
Ballads, 10423, 10423a
Balmer, R. W., 10780
Barker, R., 10412, 10980
Barns, F: E., 10760
Barrett, W. P., 10828
Barrie, J. M., 10418
Bataillon, M., 10600
Baughan, D. E., 10953a
Beaumont and Fletcher, 10424-30, 10772
Beese, M: A., 10572
Bellessort, A., 10619, 10742, 10748, 10786, 10885, 10891
Bennett, J:, 10570
Bennett, R. J. A., 10410
Berkelman, R. G., 10677
Bertreux, H., 10713
Bibliography, 10431-35a
Biesterfeldt, P. W., 10668
Bill, A. H., 10949
Biography, 10412, 10436-55, 10634
Bishop, J. P., 10914
Black, M. W., 10543, 10613
Blackstone, B., 10441, 10442, 10518
Blyton, W. J., 10487
Boas, F. S., 10513, 10527, 10592, 10871, 10978
Bock, H., 10414, 10415
Bond, R. W., 10496, 10722, 10741, 10753, 10796, 10881, 10915
Book Titles, 10456-67
Borden, C., 10626
Bowen, E:, 10810
Bowers, F. T., 10558, 10669, 10933
Bradbrook, M: C., 10976
Brahan, T., 10791a, 10857
Breton, Nicholas, 10468-69
Bridgewater, H., 10408, 10416, 10419, 10421
Bridie, J., 10850
Bronson, B. H., 10589, 10737
Brooke, C. F. T., 10441, 10529, 10591, 10731, 10866, 10932

Brooks, E. St. J., 10547
Brooks, P., 10614
Brown, H., 10946
Brown, I., 10871
Brown, J. M., 10781
Bryson, F. R., 10586
Buck, E:, 10736a
Bullett, G., 10854
Bullokar, Wm., 10679
Bullough, G., 10406
Burke, C. B., 10960a, 10962
Busse, A., 10769
Bush, D., 10688, 10730
Byrom, H. J., 10925

C

C., T. C., 10774
Caclamanos, D., 10986
Cadoux, A. T., 10607
Campbell, L: B., 10644, 10883
Campbell, O. J., 10759, 10858
Carlton, G:, 10609
Carver, P. L., 10775
Cary, L., 10466
Casseres, B. de, 10508
Catholicism of Sh, 10808a
Caudwell, C., 10907
Cawley, R. R., 10494, 10525
Cecil, Wm., 10680a
Chambers, R. W., 10498
Chambrun, C: L., 10438, 10444
Chapman, George, 10470-77, 10525
Charlton, H. B., 10479, 10481, 10735, 10739, 10740, 10792, 10797, 10814, 10829, 10836, 10844, 10846, 10871, 10875, 10884, 10887, 10893
Chew, S. C., 10441
Christian, M: G., 10702
Church, R. W., 10918
Clark, A. M., 10789
Clark, E: G., 10529, 10804
Clark, E: T., 10731, 10732
Clarke, A. H. T., 10813
Clubb, M. D., 10866
Cohen, A., 10819
Cole, C., 10460
Coles, B:, 10763, 10827
Collier, John P., 10478
Collingwood, R. G., 10909
Colum, M: M., 10493
Comedy, 10479-82
'Comedy of Errors', 10740-42
Commentary, Shn, 10443, 10450, 10453, 10483-511, 10589, 10608, 10734, 10758, 10985
Connington, J. J., 10465
Contemporaries, Sh's, 10512-19a
Contemporary Drama, 10453, 10520-30
Contemporary Poetry, 10531-46
Contemporary Prose, 10547-49
'Coriolanus', 10449, 10743-48
Costume, 10550-51a
Cox, E. H., 10492
Craig, G., 10391, 10393, 10395
Craig, H., 10432, 10500, 10734, 10766, 10773
Cripps, A. R., 10756, 10870
Crofts, J., 10837
Crofts, T., 10479
Cruickshank, C. G., 10595
Crum, G: B., 10459
Crundell, H. W., 10828
Cunningham, H., 10809
Curry, W. C., 10500, 10734, 10817, 10879
'Cymbeline', 10486, 10749-53
Cypher Theory, 10552-54

D

Dale, J., 10506
Daniel, Samuel, 10555
Daniels, R. B., 10935
Darby, R. H., 10811a
Darlington, W. A., 10506
Davenant, Sir William, 10556
Davenport, A., 10928
Dawson, G. E., 10920
Dayton, W., 10785
'Death and Eliz'n Tragedy', 10526
Dekker, Thomas, 10484, 10523, 10557-61
Delattre, F., 10477, 10622
Deloney, Thomas, 10562
Derby-Shakspere Theory, 10563-64
Design, the Arts of, 10483
Deutschbein, M., 10782a
Dinamov, S. S., 10942
Dobrée, B., 10482, 10484
Dodd, A. H., 10599
Doherty, E:, 10458
Donne, John, 10543, 10565-74
Douglas, A., 10475, 10690, 10870
Draat, P. F., Van, 10834
Drake, 10598
Drama, 10575-81
Draper, J. W., 10480, 10499, 10507a, 10790, 10798, 10818, 10841, 10886, 10890
Drayton, Michael, 10582-85
Drew, E:, 10521, 10577, 10784
Drinkwater, J., 10916
Duelling, 10586
Dupouy, A., 10901
Durham, W. H., 10976

E

E., O., 10871
Eagle, R. L., 10968
Eckhardt, E., 10643a, 10688a, 10734, 10879
Editing, Editions, 10587-89a, 10613
Ehrensperger, H. A., 10579
Ehrentreich, A., 10628
Elizabeth, Queen, 10590-92
Ellis-Fermor, U: M., 10520, 10672
Empson, W., 10537, 10733, 10831
Environment, 10453, 10593-99
Erasmus, 10600-07
Ervine, S. J., 10972
Ethics, 10608
Ethridge, W. S., 10457
Evans, M., 10778, 10781, 10785, 10793
Ewen, C. L. E., 10411, 10439, 10495, 10501a, 10929

F

F., C. D., 10871
Fairchild, A. H., 10483
'Faithful Shepherdess, The', 10425
Farjeon, H., 10587
Farmer, H. J., 10473
Fechter, P., 10580
Feely, J. M., 10552
Fehling, J., 10861
Fencl, A., 10488
'Ferrar Papers, The [*Nic*], 10518
Fictionised, Sh, 10609-10, 10874
Firth, C. H., 10490, 10930
Flasdieck, H. M., 10833
Fletcher, J. B., 10961
Fluegel, H., 10983
Flynn, C., 10463
Fogarty, J. E., 10692
Folios, 10611-15
Ford, F. M., 10503
Ford, John, 10616
Forgeries, 10617
France and French Criticism, 10618-22
Franz, W., 10676
Frerking, J., 10768
French, J. M., 10931
Friedland, L. S., 10956
Friedlander, M., 10399
Fripp, E. I., 10443, 10451
Funke, O., 10679
Fussell, G. E., 10515
Fustian, 10529

G

Gardiner, H: L., 10770
Garrett, C: H., 10937
Garrick, David, 10623-24
Gaunt, H. C. A., 10506
Gee, J. A., 1061
Geoghegan, H., 10848
German Criticism & Germany, 10625-33a
Gilbert, A. H., 10651
Gill, M:, 10464
Gill, W. W., 10921
Gillet, L., 10452
Glen, E:, 10744
Goldman, M. S., 10953
Gottfried, R. B., 10966
Goudge, E:, 10874
Graham, C. B., 10657
Granville-Barker, H., 10761
Gree, C. A., 10802
Greek Tragedy, Origin of, 10578
Greene, Robert, 10634-37
Greenewald, G. M., 10808a
Greg, W. W., 10530, 10659, 10663, 10837, 10858
Grierson, H. J. C., 10957
Groethuysen, B., 10718
Gruen, W., 10712

H

H., F. E. C., 10446, 10708
Habgood, F. E. C., 10706
Hall, J., 10946
Haller, W., 10938
Halstead, W. L., 10561
Hamilton, G. R., 10903
'Hamlet', 10754-88, 10939
Harbage, A., 10426, 10947
Hard, F., 10675, 10965
Harrison, G. B., 10506
Hartman, H., 10549
Hashagen, J., 10648
'Hathaway, Anne', 10609
Hausman, J. J., 10711
Hawkins, D., 10486
Hay, C: H., 10720
Hayes, A. McH., 10534
Hayward, J., 10697
Hazen, A. T., 10589a
Hecksher, W. S., 10691
Heffner, R., 10957, 10960, 10967
Heltzel, V. B., 10469, 10512, 10571
Hemingway, S. B., 10789
Henderson, P., 10688a
Hennecke, H., 10574
'Henry IV', 10487, 10789-96, 10801
'Henry V', 10797-99, 10801
'Henry VI', 10620, 10800-03
Herbert, George, 10638-39
Heuer, H., 10568, 10632, 10747
Hewins, N., 10703
Heywood, John, 10640-42

Heywood, Thomas, 10643-43a
Hill, R., 10705
Hillyer, R. S., 10908, 10988
History, Historical Plays, 10644
Hobhouse, C., 10949
Hodge, M., 10462
Hodgson, N. H., 10423a
Holzknecht, K. J., 10684
Hope, H. R., 10948
Hoppe, H. R., 10863, 10864
Hotson, J. L., 10437, 10441, 10532, 10611, 10876
Houghton, A. A., 10707
Houghton, N., 10944
Howard, R. G., 10683
Howarth, R. G., 10878
Hubler, E., 10990
Huch, R., 10625
Hueber, F. M., 10447
Hughes, M. Y., 10734
Humor, 10645
Husain, I., 10573
Hutchinson, F. E., 10638
Hutchinson, P., 10598

I

Influence, 10424, 10430, 10646-47, 10649, 10772, 10777, 10822
Irving, H., 10390, 10391, 10393, 10395
Isaacs, J., 10506
Italy, 10648-51

J

Jack, P. M., 10437, 10446, 10635
'Jacobean Sh, The', 10498
Jaggard, W., 10660, 10986
James I, 10652-53
Jeffrey, S., 10871
Jenkins, R., 10963
Jews, 10832
John, L. C., 10544
Johnson, F. R., 10400
Johnston, M., 10749
Jones, G., 10635
Jones, R. F., 10567
Jones, W. A., 10813
Jonson, B., 10453, 10485, 10523, 10525, 10555, 10654-66, 10694, 10933
'Julius Caesar', 10499, 10649, 10804-07, 10945

K

K., T. C., 10871
Kaemmerling, K., 10610
Kahan, H., 10456
Kane, R. J., 10755
Kanendonk, A. B. V., 10453
Kapp, R., 10562
Kastendieck, M. M., 10538
Keller, W., 10485a, 10882a
Kelly, F. M., 10551
Kemble, F: 10394
Kempling, W. B., 10425, 10871
Kessary, C., 10986
King, A. H., 10745
'King John', 10801, 10808-08a
'King Lear', 10449, 10809-12
Kirschbaum, L., 10667, 10811, 10815, 10926
Klein, M:, 10771
Kluckhohn, P., 10633a
Knevett, R., 10955
'Knight of the Burning Pestle, The', 10427
Knights, L. C., 10654, 10754, 10817
Knox, R. S., 10758
Kobbe, C:, 10631
Kocher, P. H., 10693
Koller, K:, 10536
Koszul, A., 10856
Kranz, W., 10807, 10807a, 10809a, 10835a
Kreuzer, J. R., 10843
Krieger, H., 10832
Kronberg, A. I., 10941
Krutch, J. W., 10781
Kuenstler, G. A., 10757
Kyd, Thomas, 10442, 10667-69a

L

Lamson, R., 10423
Langdale, A. B., 10513
Language, 10670-79
Lanoire, M., 10445
Lapsley, G., 10855
Laski, H. J., 10597
Lavaud, J., 10720
Law, 10680-80a
Lawrence, C. E., 10645
Lawrence, W. J., 10438, 10441, 10446, 10484, 10689, 10762, 10871
Lea, F. A., 10779
Lefranc, A., 10564
Leishman, J. B., 10671
Lever, K:, 10923
Levin, H., 10656, 10665
Lewin, C. S., 10569
Lewis, E. G., 10566
Lidin, V., 10943
Lievsay, J. L., 10674
Linthicum, M: C., 10550
Lion, F., 10910
'Literature as Exploration', 10906
Loane, G. G., 10471, 10472, 10474, 10474a, 10987

Lockridge, R., 10781
Long, L:, 10458
Long, M., 10911
Long, W. S., 10823
Lorch, F. W., 10899
'Love's Labor's Lost', 10813-16
Lucas, R. M., 10563
Lundholm, H:, 10806
Lyly, John, 10681-83
Lynd, R., 10871
Lyrics, 10546

M

'Macbeth', 10817-27, 10879
MacCarthy, D., 10664, 10746
MacColl, D. S., 10989
Machebeli, I., 10945
Mackail, J. W., 10491, 10602, 10905
MacLeish, A., 10898
Macy, G., 10587
Mahr, A. C., 10578
Mair, J., 10617
Manaway, J. G., 10560
Manuals, 10684
Marlowe, Christopher, 10685-93
Marriott, J., 10467
Marston, John, 10694-96
Masques, 10697
Massinger, Philip, 10523, 10698
Matthews, W., 10673
McCabe, W. H., 10727
McCabe, W. M., 10979
McCain, J. W., 10640, 10642
McCaul, R. L., 10974
McColley, G., 10822
McGinn, D. J., 10772
McGinn, D. T., 10694
McIlwraith, A. K., 10529a, 10542, 10669a
McKeithan, D. M., 10424, 10430
McKerrow, R. B., 10468, 10789, 10882, 10897
McNeal, T. H., 10634, 10636
McNeir, W. F., 10557
'Measure for Measure', 10828-31
Medicine, 10681, 10699, 10700
Menon, C. N., 10504
'Merchant of Venice, The', 10523, 10832-36
Meres, F., 10511
'Merry Wives of Windsor', 10487, 10798, 10837-40
Messiaen, P., 10800, 10801
Mettin, H. C., 10629
Metz, R., 10405, 10407, 10414
Meyer, G. P., 10639
Meystein, E. H. W., 10481
Middleton, Thomas, 10523, 10701-02
'Midsummer Night's Dream, A', 10841-44
Millican, C. B., 10953, 10955
Miscellanea, 10703-11
Montaigne, Michael, 10712-24
Moore, J. R., 10845
Morhardt, M., 10618
Morice, E. G., 10468
Morris, J. E., 10799, 10892
Mortimer, R., 10851
'Moscow Rehearsals', 10944
'Much Ado About Nothing', 10845-46
Mühlbach, E., 10980a
Muir, K., 10436, 10484, 15010a, 10689
Murray, J., 10528
Murry, J. M., 10455, 10475, 10724, 10812
Music, 10725-29, 10819
Mythology, 10666, 10730

N

N., B. H., 10585
N., L., 10743
Nash, C. A., 10606
Nethercot, A. H., 10556
Newdigate, B. H., 10853
Nicoll, A., 10434, 10506, 10697
Norris, H., 10551a
Nungezer, E., 10555

O

O'Conner, J. F., 10429, 10710
O'Loughlin, S., 10436, 10510a
Ormsbee, H:, 10392
Orthography, 10404
Osgood, C. G., 10730
'Othello', 10847-51, 10940, 10945
'Outlines of Sh's Plays', 10684
Oxford-Shakspere Theory, 10731-32

P

'Palladis Tamia (1598)', 10511
Parker, W. P., 10704
Parrott, T. M., 10766, 10773, 10990
Parsons, A. E., 10576
Pastorals, 10733
Patrick, D. L., 10858
Pattison, B., 10728
Pechel, R., 10607
Peterson, H., 10977
Phillips, A. L., 10973
Philosophy, 10500, 10734, 10788, 10817, 10879
'Phoenix and the Turtle, The', 10853, 10854
Pinto, V. de S., 10435, 10728
'Play in Poetry', 10900
Plays, 10735-851, 10858-65, 10875-96
Poel, Wm., 10397

Poems, 10852-54, 10869
Poetics, 10897-919
Political thought, 10597
Portraits, Sh's, 10920
Powys, J. C., 10505, 10523
Praz, M., 10650
Preis, A., 10435a
Prescott, K: H., 10554
Price, H. T., 10789, 10858
Producing Sh, 10921-22
Pronier, E., 10519a
Propaganda, 10579
Proverbs, 10923
Psychology, 10924
Puritanism, Rise of, 10938
Puttenham, G., 10925
Pyle, F., 10539, 10540
Pym, D:, 10981

Q

Quartos, 10926
Quotations, 10927

R

R., V. H., 10871
Radlovaya, A:, 10939
Raleigh, Walter, 10928-32
Randolph, T., 10772, 10933
Ransom, J. C., 10867, 10919
Raymond, M., 10721
Raysor, T. M., 10975
Relics, 10934
Religion, 10518, 10581, 10599, 10808a, 10935-38
Renwick, W. L., 10960
Revels Office, The, 10519
Rice, A. P., 10816
'Richard II', 10499, 10644, 10801, 10855-57
'Richard III', 10858-61, 10945
Richter, H:, 10396
Ringler, W., 10478, 10682
Rix, H. D., 10958
Robertson, J., 10514
Rogers, B., 10587
Rogers, C., 10794
Rollins, H. E., 10444, 10852
'Romeo & Juliet', 10862-65
Rosenblatt, L: M., 10906
Ross, R., 10684
Rowse, A. L., 10506
'Russell, Thomas', 10437, 10441, 10532, 10611
Russia, 10840, 10888, 10939-45
Rylands, G., 10481, 10484

S

S., H., 10448
Sanborn, H., 10982
Sargeaunt, M: J., 10616
Satire, 10732, 10946
Sauer, P. R., 10545
Schindler, P., 10936
Schlösser, R., 10629b
Schmidt, W., 10873, 10985
Schroeder, F. R., 10767
Schücking, L. L., 10667a, 10754, 10765
Schulze, I. L., 10970
Schwartz, H. W., 10725
Seamanship, Sh's, 10501a
Seaton, E:, 10838
Sensabaugh, G. F., 10616, 10969
Seymour, H., 10417
Shaaber, M. A., 10613, 10791
Shaftel, O. H., 10485
Shapiro, I. A., 10567
Shaver, C. L., 10470
Shaw, G. B., 10750
Shchepkinoi-Kupernik, T. L., 10840
Shewmake, E. F., 10678
Shirley, James, 10772, 10947
Shirley, J. W., 10795
Shorthand, 10948
Sidney, Philip, 10485, 10799, 10949-54
Siebeck, B:, 10950
Silk, C. E. B., 10565
Simpson, E:, 10658
Simpson, P., 10516, 10701
Sinha, A. B. N., 10497
Sisson, C. J., 10653, 10832a
Skinner, M: O., 10389, 10461
Sloane, W., 10398
Smernova, A. A., 10941, 10942
Smith, H. D., 10643
Smith, R. M., 10612, 10613, 10734
Sokolovski, A. L., 10940
Sommer, I., 10404
Sonnet sequences, 10544
'Sonnets, Sh's', 10436, 10866-74
Spencer, T., 10526, 10654, 10704, 10788
Spender, S., 10912
Spenser, Edmund, 10453, 10596, 10622, 10645, 10688, 10955-71
Stahl, E. L., 10979a
Stamm, R., 10668
Stange, C:, 10605
Steeholm, C:, 10652
Steeholm, H., 10652
Stein, E: P., 10623
Steitz-Eicker, H:, 10633
Stevenson, B., 10927
Stoll, E. E., 10505a

Stonier, G. W., 10486
Stratford-on-Avon, 10972
Strode, E., 10546
Strode, H., 10438
Stroup, T. B., 10510
Strowski, F., 10715, 10716, 10717
Summers, M., 10859
Swaen, A. E. H., 10725
Symons, A. J. A., 10870

T

'Taming of the Shrew, The', 10875
Tannenbaum, S. A., 10403, 10428, 10431, 10476, 10662, 10698, 10764, 10773, 10852, 10871, 10872, 10894
Tate, A., 10913
Taylor, G. C., 10895
Teaching, 10973-74
Technique, 10484, 10975-77
Telfer, R. S., 10990
'Tempest, The', **10486, 10876-79.**
Thaler, A., 10483, 10507
Theatre, Theatrical History, 10978-80a
Theobald, B. G., 10454
Thomas, J., 10719
Thompson, D. W., 10862
Thomson, G., 10984
Thomson, W., 10869, 10871
Thorne, S. E., 10680
Tilley, M. P., 10541, 10687, 10696
Tillotson, G., 10520, 10670, 10954
Tillotson, K:, 10526, 10584
Tillyard, E. M. W., 10486, 10964
Tilney, E., 10519
Timmermans, B. J. H. M., 10604
'Timon of Athens,' 10449, 10880
Tinkler, F. C., 10751
'Titus Andronicus', 10882-82a
Tourneur, Cyril, 10981
Tourneur, Z., 10736
Tragedy, 10982-85
Translations, 10630, 10986
Traub, W., 10738
Traver, H:, 10835
Traversi, D. A., 10885a
'Troilus & Cressida', 10883-85a
Turnell, M., 10917
Turner, W. J., 10821
'Twelfth Night', 10860, 10886-92, 10941
'Two Gentlemen of Verona', **10893-94**

U

Untermeyer, L., 10900

V

Van Dam, B. A. P., 10509
Van Doren, M., 10502
Van Lennep, W., 10859
Vandérem, F., 10621
Vandiver, E. P., Jr., 10646, 10647
Vernon, G., 10781
Verse, 10543, 10914, 10987-89
Vest, W. E., 10700
'Voyagers and Eliz'n Drama, The', 10525

W

W., W. E., 10871
Wagner, B. M., 10951
Wagner, J., 10629a
Walbrook, H. M., 10390
Walker, A. L., 10924, 10925
Walters, P., 10553
Ward, C. E., 10661
Watkins, H., 10389
Warwickshire, 10442
Watson, S. R., 10799, 10952
Watson, Y., 10581
Watt, H. A., 10684
Welles, O., 10705
Wells, H. W., 10655
Wheeler, C. F., 10666
Whibley, L., 10624
Whipple, S. R., 10781
White, B:, 10489
White, I. H., 10575
Willard, O. M., 10593
Willcock, G. D., 10925
Williams, C., 10450, 10620, **10806a**
Williams, R. D., 10524
Williamson, C. C. H., 10533
Williamson, F., 10440
Williamson, J. A., 10598
Wilson, A., 10522
Wilson, F. P., 10548
Wilson, H. M., 10826
Wilson, J. D., 10454, 10813
'Winter's Tale', 10895-96
Witt, W. H., 10699
Wolff, M. J., 10649
Wood, H. H., 10695
Works, Sh's, 10990
Wright, C. T., 10523
Wright, L. B., 10517

Y

Young, G. M., 10813
Young, S., 10781

THE REFLECTIVE ELEMENT IN FALSTAFF

By SAMUEL A. SMALL

OF the various opinions regarding Falstaff's outlook on life, perhaps the view that is most generally accepted is that he intentionally tries to charm away the realities of life by an over-abundance of wit, which extends in its range from common ribaldry to high flights of fancy. Having an ingenious temperament for inventing lies and for justifying his false ways of living, he uses his wit to violate truth and dignity in life. In defending himself against the opposition of others, he takes pride in matching his wit with their hostile designs, and in using logical argument to outplay them. The colorful atmosphere of all that Falstaff says and does is the chief attribute of his personality, as it is also the chief entertainment in the plays in which this character appears.

The contrast between the age and fatness of his body, and the youthful, subtle keenness of his intellect forms a laughter-provoking incongruity which is always present in the mind of the audience; in other words, nothing is ever said or done by the fat knight which is not immediately thrown into a ridiculous light by the bulkiness of his body. The bigness of his body and his advanced age are the two simple physical matters about him which create the "fun" in Falstaff as a stage figure.

But Falstaff is aware that these physical encumbrances are handicaps. He speaks of them regretfully as obstructing his efforts to live an active life. This realization of the increasing limitations of old age directs his attention to a great extent toward abstract inquiries on the passing of time, which indicates a melancholy strain in Falstaff. So, instead of being a simple conventional coxcomb, or a witty-mouthed clown, Falstaff is both of these with inner qualities of self-reflectoin added. Whatever Falstaff's wit creates in words, we are noticing quietly the serious man who pities himself and who would have others pity him.

Falstaff is a stage clown and wit, but one who is senstitive

regarding his size and age; otherwise, Shakspere could not have imbued this character with the depth of feeling which he shows in many places. Prince Hal knows Falstaff's sensitiveness and knows, too, that he will react to the least suggestion of physical decay. Prince Hal, who never shows him any real kindness, probes him to the quick about his physical decline, and seems to take with Poins a brutal pleasure in watching how these remarks bring out of Falstaff a wealth of lies.

> Thou art so fat-witted, with drinking of old sack, and unbuttoning thee after supper (I, ii); What says Sir John Sack-and-Sugar? (I, ii); You will, chops? (I, ii); Farewell, thou latter Spring! farewell, All-hallown Summer! (I, ii); Peace, ye fat-kidney'd rascal! (II, ii); Peace, ye fat-guts! (II, ii); Didst thou never see Titan kiss a dish of butter? II, iv); How now, wool-sack! (II, iv); Why, you whoreson round man (II, iv); Zwounds, ye fat paunch (II, iv); Thou greasy tallow-keech (II, iv); This huge hill of flesh (II, iv); Here comes lean Jack, here comes bare-bone. (II, iv); How now, my sweet creature of bombast! (II, iv); Trunk of humours (II, iv); That old white-bearded Satan (II, iv); How now, blown Jack, how now, quilt! (IV, ii); For thy theft hath already made thee butter. (IV, ii); Unless you call three fingers on the ribs bare. (IV, ii).

From the first appearance of the Prince in the plays to the end, his words lampoon the Fat knight on the subject of his bodily infirmities. Falstaff's reactions are interesting, and I believe the reason for Falstaff's irresponsibility to moral principles, especially in his lies and expressions of contempt for humanity, are to be understood as reactions to this constant probing by the Prince into his bodily decay. Only once or twice does Falstaff strike back directly at the Prince with violent words:

> Away, you starveling, you eel-skin, you dried neat's tongue, you bull's pizzle, you stock-fish,—O, for breath to utter what is like thee!—you tailor's-yard, you sheath, you bow-case, you vile-standing tuck,—(II, iv).

But all of Falstaff's unprincipled actions, his cowardice, lying, thieving, back-biting, etc., are crude elements of wit and humor. Where are the finer points of characterization

that deepen or enliven the picture of the fat knight? The First Part of *Henry IV* was produced in 1597 and at that time Shakspere had reached the stage in his career where emotional acting was the chief ingredient of good characterization.

The maintenance of good emotional characterization in Shakspere can be traced in the playwright's use of the soliloquy and of the aside. He seemed to find in the soliloquy a medium for expressing the psychological workings of his characters. We can easily detect these emotional moments in Shakspere's characters, even in his early days. Romeo and Juliet become living, thoughtful characters, emotional and universal, because, as the play progresses, Shakspere uses the soliloquy in their mouths to bring out the depth of their souls. When the end of this play is reached, the two characters who soliloquize in the tomb are not emotionally the same as the Romeo and Juliet of the beginning of the play.

Falstaff "keeps a sort of dignity," as one commentator expresses it. This dignity is the result of a number of strokes of the pen which Shakspere throws in to make of Falstaff something more than a joyous wit. There are passages which lead one easily to feel his inner mind. Not only soliloquies and asides, but Falstaff's method of reasoning often betrays a deeper side to him. Shakspere always used the method of a sudden inner shift whenever he wished to change the opinion of the audience in favor of any character. We all know how the clown, Costard, in *Love's Labor's Lost,* is made human by some 35 lines. We actually like Costard at the end of the play because of the sentiment contained in these lines. Since Shakspere does this with Costard, Launcelot, and others in the early plays, there is no doubt that Shakspere meant Falstaff to be, in our conception of him, a full-fledged man and not merely a puppet.

When Shakspere began the writing of comedy, he, like other playwrights of his time, depended on stage wit, but much of the wit in his early plays is accompanied by asides and soliloquies intended to keep the audience guided as to

the plot. This is first clearly revealed in Biron, the hero of *Love's Labor's Lost*. Shakspere's purpose in thus enlarging the function of the aside to that of a soliloquy was to facilitate plot construction by condensing material, but the revelation of character through this means tended to heighten the person as a living being. The lowest type of wit or clown can thus become a subject of our sympathies (like Costard) by putting in his mouth something of his inner feelings. Minor persons in the plays become more than the conventional puppets they were at first meant to be. By the stroke of a few lines, the audience can be made to see more in the character than what the stage requirements called for. To reduce every event so as to fit the whole play into five acts is a strict dramatic necessity, calling for high selectiveness and condensation. The only way a dramatist may break through this shell of convention, which forces him to cut much flesh and blood from the characters, is to drop remarks here and there from minor characters, or through the self-revealing soliloquy. On the Shaksperian stage this was not hard to accomplish because the actor was close to and on familiar terms with the audience.

To turn comedy into tragedy is one of the great achievements of Shakspere; so it should not surprise us to find an underlying tragic note through the use of a method that reveals the inner mind, however much the subject shows humorous content. The outstanding example of a clownish character which was worked into a tragic character is Shylock. Shakspere found this Jew in an old play and possibly in an old ballad. He meant Shylock to be a ridiculous clownish type of villain to contrast with the romantic and colorful love stories of Portia and Jessica. Shylock, the hated Jew, was clownish and ludicrous; but Shakspere was not content to let him be the conventional clown he found him. He opens up to the audience through asides and soliloquies avenues of approach to the secret recesses of shylock's mind. We see his meanness and selfishness, but we also feel the nobility of his mind as a Jewish business man and father who has been deeply wronged by the treatment of the Christians.

The same touch of sympathy comes out of Falstaff's speeches. The method is the same as that used in Shylock, though they are different in kind. Falstaff's gluttony, boisterousness, wit, and cowardice are all given to us plainly as definite traits, and these Shakspere found, as he did the clownishness of Shylock, in the original versions. But, as I shall show below, many of Falstaff's speeches reveal a method that gives a sympathetic touch to his character which any one in the audience can feel. How could it have been otherwise? At the time Shakspere wrote *Henry IV,* Part I, he was enlivening all his characters with human traits, and certainly Falstaff in his hands could not remain the Falstaff of his earlier forebears. At this late period, he naturally touched Falstaff with deeper qualities of character than the former clowns had, without spoiling his qualities as a stage wit.

There is no reason for antagonistic points of view between the school of thought which regards Falstaff as a stage clown and the school of thought which allows him serious qualities of character. A clown may have character and still remain a clown and wit on the stage. To imbue Falstaff with qualities of soul Shakspere did not have to drop the clown in him; the clown may be given a large atmosphere of life in which to live.. The clown who has moments of melancholia was known in literature long before Shakspere's time. By 1597, not merely had the dramatist to conceive the broad outlines of a method to bring pathos to the minds of the audience, he had also to blend his method into the character itself so as to make the character more natural. So far as Shakspere's development as a dramatist is concerned, it is wrong to study comedy and tragedy separately. Shakspere's methods, which he learned in the early days of his career, were guided by his imitation of Marlowe, and still earlier by the cruder methods of Kyd. *The Spanish Tragedy* and *The Jew* served Shakspere as the school in which he learned to present characters so as to touch the hearts of his audience.

Previous to this point in the development of Shakspere

as a dramatist, wit for wit's sake was everything to a dramatist's success. Plays like *The Comedy of Errors* and *Love's Labor's Lost* show that Shakspere was at this early period working the one tool which had to function correctly to bring success to the playwright. When *The Spanish Tragedy* appeared, the playwright found it neccessary to stress certain elements which derived from Seneca. These requirements were revolutionary as they tended to stress inner activities of characters in an artificially devised plot. The plot suffered, as we may see in a play like *Titus Andronicus,* but methods to evoke pitiful appeals were crudely effective. The tragic story at this time had to be chosen to support the Senecan medium. Marlowe's greatness was to unify the Senecan stock-in-trade tools in the person of one man, and to make this person bristle with all the paraphernalia of the Senecan school. His success forced other playwrights, including Shakspere, to study one character to the neglect of the others in the play. Tragic character still had to be chosen for the exemplification of his villain-hero. Marlowe, in *The Jew,* then led the way into a new field of story materials. This was in history where comedy as well as tragedy existed. His use of the villain, too, showed the way to the use of Senecan elements in persons who were fundamentally not made for suffering. Marlowe may be said therefore to have weakened the strict application of Senecan matter to strictly serious figures by using the broader field of history and extending the use to persons essentially villainous instead of heroic.

In his depiction of Richard III, Shakspere followed suit and strove to out-do Marlowe. The lines followed were in the direction of breadth and villainy. Soliloquizing was subordinated to a mere stage technique to keep the audience informed on matters of plot and character. The soliloquy helped (or one may say made it possible for) the playwright to open up a larger range of action and thought. It was largely in keeping with the largeness of the stage itself. Furthermore, and this is the most important point to us, the soliloquy served as the main tool for the playwright to tie together the straggling parts of the old chron-

icles. Here it served as a means of condensing material when condensation was necessary. The same technical use of the soliloquy for serious drama was easily transferred to its use in comedy. Wit and farce constituted the main ingredients of early playwriting. But whether of refined, witty dialogue or of crude force, the individualizing of character was a matter of later development, and came into being when playwrights learned the value of soliloquy as a stage tactic to deepen characterization and to condense story interest. We may find *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* a successful play from the point of view of refined wit. We may note with interest the crude antics of Launce. But both of these elements take on a deeper significance when, later, Shakspere puts the soliloquy in the mouths of characters like Launcelot, Romeo, and Antonio.

Launcelot's speech at the beginning of the second scene of the second act in *The Merchant of Venice* is information to the audience regarding the crude working of the clown's mind. The inner simplicity of his mind is at once apparent. Similarly, Romeo is at once interpreted by us as a love-sick lover of the simplest and purest type. So, also, Antonio tells us how we should interpret his sadnes as part of the construction of the plot. His idea of Friendship is of the simplest and purest type. The early use of the soliloquy by Shakspere was simply as a stage device for keeping the audience informed on intentions and motives. Its value on a large platform stage is clearly evident when the poetry that issues from the mouths of single characters, concentrates attention on them, instead of leaving the bareness of the stage open to the wandering attention of the spectators. Sparkling wit acts in the same way of brightening up the stage, but the soliloquy has the advantage of the psychological appeal.

There are four ways of introducing psychological feeling into dramatic composition:

1. By having someone in the play make a remark about another character.
2. By making the relationship between two characters reveal some hidden feeling.

3. By having a character speak reflectively in the presence of another or in soliloquy.

These are placed in order of their intensity. The first may be simply a passing remark of little importance; while the last may be the means of searching the very soul of the character. These methods may be used for humorous purposes, but the serious psychological import is never lost. The audience may laugh and feel seriously at the same time. For that matter, do we not laugh at Othello for being a blockhead; do we not laugh at Hamlet for his unmanly fear; do we not laugh at all of Shakspere's tragic characters for their fool-hardiness? Mirth is the principal thing about Falstaff, but Falstaff indulges in matters concerning the human race at large and these passages take root in us as we laugh.

Notice Falstaff's reactions to Prince Hal's rough cynicism:

Prince: Peace, ye fat-guts! lie down; lay thine ear close to the ground, and list if thou canst hear the tread of travellers.

Fal: Have you any levers to lift me up again, being down? I'll not bear mine own flesh so far a-foot again for all the coin in thy father's exchequer. What a plague mean ye to colt me thus?

Prince: Thou liest; thou art not colted, thou art uncolted.

Fal. I pr'ythee, good Prince Hal, help me to my horse, good king's son.

Prince: Out, ye rogue! Shall I be your ostler?

Fal: Go, hang thyself in thine own heir-apparent garters! If I be ta'en, I'll peach for this. An I have not ballads made on you all, and sung to filthy tunes, let a cup of sack be my poison. When a jest is so forward, and a-foot too, I hate it. (II, ii).

This is a typical example of how Falstaff answers the cruel jibes of the Prince. He first makes a joke of his own inability to lift himself up without levers, thus becoming a butt for the others to laugh at. Then he shows a typical independent disposition by refusing to "budge." The reference to the king's exchequer throws in an incongruous

relationship. The last remark, "What a plague mean ye to colt me thus?" is a sudden shift, and at the same time a skilful denial of what he has just done, throwing the responsibility on the Prince. When the Prince unfeelingly casts him the lie, Falstaff shifts to another mood, that of pleading. This is the most ridiculous of his shifts as he asks the king's son to help him on his horse. When the Prince baffles him in this last humor of his, he bursts into a tirade of words against the Prince, attacking his leanness, because he is still smarting under the words "fat-guts" which the Prince hurled at him in the first place.

There is no question but that Shakspere meant it all for the laughter-provoking power of the dialogue. The beginning and end of this verbal duel shows the fat knight trying to foil the thrusts of the Prince. In this dialogue, typical of all such verbal duels, it is easy to see that Falstaff and the Prince are different in their attitudes. Hal is rough, blunt, and unfeeling. Falstaff is to a great extent on the defensive and uses shifty tactics to ward off accusations from the Prince and Poins. In his eagerness to keep himself clear, he drops all principles of truth and resorts to merely an imaginative interpretation of human relationships. In this way he finds an unlimited resource in both realistic and romantic wit. His eagerness to explain his grounds gives him a positive manner. Which of these two characters governs the situation? In every case, it is the Prince, who takes the fat knight on or shakes him off. Our sympathies go out to Falstaff, as he is the entertainer who is constantly using his wits to defend and explain himself.

We do not sympathize with him as we do with a tragic hero. There is no inner consciousness in Falstaff that is suffering or spiritually struggling. Nothing like that, but Falstaff is the "underdog," and our sympathies easily find him more abused than abusing others. Shakspere, no doubt, was aware of this. He has an idea about Falstaff that is greater in his mind than the clownish wit-mongering fat knight. This idea was in no sense a metaphysical one, a truth larger than the play itself—but an effective idea just

the same, and one that contributed to Falstaff's humorous movements.

This idea shows itself in two ways. First, a vein of self-pity runs through much of what Falstaff says. Shakspere uses remorse somewhat mechanically in his tragical figures to indicate a human touch to hardened criminals. So arbitrary is this use that it probably is a stage device to make the character more horrifying than a mere hardened criminal who has no lapse of conscience. This device came from the Senecan school where remorse is used to make the characters sensational. To put this tragic device in Falstaff, who is not criminal minded, adds a note of keen humor, as it is incongruous with his clownishness and wit. We shudder when Macbeth utters remorse immediately after the murder of Duncan; while we laugh heartily when we hear Falstaff pass off a remark of pity and remore on himself and the world:

> Go thy ways, old Jack: die when thou wilt; if manhood, good manhood, be not forgot upon the face of the Earth, then am I a shotten herring. There live not three good men unhanged in England; and one of them is fat, and grows old: God help the while! a bad world, I say. I would I were a weaver; I could sing psalms or any thing,—a plague of all cowards! I say still. (III, iv).

The vein of self-pity intensifies the comic effect of the scene, just as the introduction of a comic device into tragedy (for example, the porter scene in *Macbeth*) intensifies the tragic effect of the scene. The pity which Falstaff here expresses, though incongruous with the character of Falstaff as stage clown, and the immediate circumstances, serves to humanize a character who would otherwise be merely a mechanical figure.

Such use of self-pity for the purpose of relieving and intensifying a comic scene and often for the purpose of creating real laughter is justifiable from the playwright's point of view, because it gives him another means of humanizing the character and of shifting the viewpoint. But what deepens Falstaff's character, and what leads the reader to suspect that he is much more than an ordinary dramatic

figure, is the care with which Falstaff draws out these expressions of self-pity into details of logical arguments. It is easy to laugh at Falstaff when he first begins a speech showing self-pity, for our laughter must come suddenly and not remain too long with us. But after our outburst of laughter, we begin to study Falstaff, who continues to hold our minds by keeping logically to the point he has introduced. When the Prince asks him, "How long is't ago, Jack, since thou saw'st thine own knee?" Falstaff gives a pitiful tale:

> My own knee! when I was about thy years, Hal, I was not an eagle's talon in the waist; I could have crept into any alderman's thumb-ring: a plague of sighing and grief! it blows a man up like a bladder. (II, iv).

In the mock play which the Prince and Falstaff perform together, the latter seizes the opportunity of talking about himself in a pitiful way. He is as much interested in expressing self-pity, as he is in attracting the Prince.

> That he is old—the more the pity,—his white hairs do witness it; but that he is—saving your reverence—a whoremaster, that I utterly deny. If sack and sugar be a fault, God help the wicked! if to be old and merry be a sin, then many an old host that I know is damn'd; if to be fat is to be hated, then Pharaoh's lean kine are to be loved. No, my good lord; banish Poins; but, for sweet Jack Falstaff, valiant Jack Falstaff, and therefore more valiant, being, as he is, old Jack Falstaff, banish not him thy Harry's company; banish plump Jack, and banish all the world! (II, iv).

One bursts out in laughter when Falstaff begins to pity himself as an old abused man, but he does not stop with a simple expresion of his feelings; he enters into a debate, the purpose of which is to defend his good name. At the end the tone of self-pity changes to that of egotism.

Perhaps the place where Falstaff is more simple-hearted and sincere than at any other is at the beginning of Scene iii, Act III. We laugh at him, of course, as he compares himself to an old apple-John, and then to a brewer's horse. But Shakspere's intention must have been more than mere laughter, for the self-pity is stressed so much that we feel a deeper interest in Falstaff than we would in a butt for our

mere entertainment. Shakspere even mentions in this speech that Falstaff is looking back remorsefully to the time he went to church.

> Bardolph, am I not fallen away vilely since this last action? do I not bate? do I not dwindle? Why, my skin hangs about me like an old lady's loose gown; I am withered like an old apple-john. Well, I'll repent, and that suddenly, while I am in some liking; I shall be out of heart shortly, and then I shall have no strength to repent. And I have not forgotten what the inside of a church is made of, I am a peppercorn, a brewer's horse: the inside of a church! Company, villainous company, hath been the spoil of me. (III, iii)

After this speech we begin to regard Falstaff as a man with enough background in his life and with enough self-consciousness to make us see two sides to his character: one which he presents to the Prince, and the other which enhances the entertaining features of Falstaff's character, but which is dwelt upon and stressed until we begin to feel that Falstaff is perhaps a man who has seen better days.

Again this same note of self-pity occurs in the very midst of a scene in which Falstaff is most despicable. His treatment of the Hostess is the meanest and most unforgivable incident in Falstaff's life. Yet, when the Prince asks him, "Art thou not ashamed?" he astonishes us with an assertion of his innocence, which makes us at once laugh at him, for the idea at the moment is certainly a ridiculous one. But, Falstaff is not merely giving a straightforward assertion of his innocence; he evinces definite subjective pity for himself. No man could possibly breathe this sentiment in more feeling language than Falstaff's:

> Dost thou hear, Hal? thou know'st, in the state of innocency Adam fell; and what should poor Jack Falstaff do in the days of villainy! Thou see'st I have more flesh than another man; and therefore more frailty. (III, iii).

Most commentators rightly accept the view that Falstaff practices the art of feigning in order to entertain the Prince. He is a master in fabricating a lie in the form of a story and has the power of picturing his ideas in concrete form. The

same art of feigning also enters into Falstaff's subjective speeches. He pleads his cause in a most colorful way, throwing all principles aside, and seeming always to be conscious of his own inability to act with moral courage. He pities himself when he begins a long explanation about the unprincipled way he has handled his soldiers:

> If I be not ashamed of my soldiers, I am a soused gurnet. I have misused the King's press damnably. (IV, ii).

The rest of this soliloquy consists of thirty-four lines of witty, contemptuous slurring on human decency: "with hearts in their bellies no bigger than pins' heads," "where the glutton's dogs lick his sores," "ten times more dishonorable ragged than an old-faced ancient," "a hundred and fifty tattered prodigals lately come from swine-keeping, from eating draff and husks," "no eye hath seen such scarecrows," "the villains march wide between the legs, as if they had gyves on."

Theatrically this speech is meant to entertain the audience. The entertaining feature resides in the rhetorical skill with which Shakspere composed it. It is not directed at entertaining the Prince, for Falstaff is alone on the stage. Though it is entertaining in itself, as in the case of Launcelot's speech in *The Merchant of Venice* (Act II, Sc. iii), it also may be regarded as a character-revealing soliloquy. It probably serves both purposes. What it reveals of Falstaff's character is further proof of what has been already shown. Falstaff here shows himself to be a high-handed blasphemer of mankind endowed with the power of logical thinking. Contrasted with this, we hear in this speech that he is "ashamed" of his soldiers and that he confesses he "misused the King's press damnably." We burst out into laughter again at the cowardly blasphemer using these penitent terms. But they cannot come from a feigning mind because he is alone on the stage. He must have a strong tendency to express a self-conscious pity for himself. Notice again at the end of the play (*Henry IV,* Part I) the last words of this feigning, clownish entertainer turn our minds to serious feelings of repentance:

> If I do grow great, I'll grow less, for I'll purge and leave sack, and live cleanly as a nobleman should do. (V, iv)

In all of Shakspere's great characters, their attraction as personalities grows out of his inner knowledge of man. He did not create bloodless, mechanical automata. The breath of life comes from the good and ill which are always found mixed in them. Even the severely drawn Brutus is weak, but Hamlet is our best example of what complexity our mortality is. So, Falstaff, with every attraction of a clownish blasphemer of human order, yet shows definite signs of knowing the futility of his own false attitude toward life.

But this self-knowledge is not plainly revealed because Falstaff puts into all his actions and speeches that art of feigning, which pictures everything in a false light. Every commentator describes him as a coarse-minded, witty old man, whose corpulence adds greatly to his stage humor. Most of them see some character underlying his buffoonery.

(To be Continued)

DRAPER'S STUDY OF *HAMLET*

By JOHN WILCOX

PROFESSOR JOHN W. DRAPER is an indefatigable contributor to the scholarly journals of both hemispheres, as the reticulation of footnotes in any of his articles tells every reader. Since he has deserted the Eighteenth Century for Renaissance drama, more particularly Shakspere, we have constantly encountered his studies of minor aspects of various plays in relation to Elizabethan attitudes. To date one can list nearly forty articles on Shakspere, an impressive record indeed of scholarly "production." About ten of these are concerned specifically with *Hamlet.* Now he presents *The Hamlet of Shakespeare's Audience,*[1] professedly an assembly of earlier articles with such coordination as will make a complete study of the play; however, little of the second half of the book has appeared earlier. He considers the characters surrounding Hamlet in the light of Elizabethan lore and decides what Shakspere's audience naturally thought of them. From this vantage ground of historic insight, he proposes to reconsider the personality of Hamlet and the plot, the setting, the style, and the theme of the play.

In general the study of Elizabethan lore has been especially fruitful in the revelation of conventions, that is, in filling in properly those parts of a play which the author does not make explicit because he can trust his audience to understand.

Shakspere makes his main points plainly enough; such study is therefore productive of footnotes to side issues and occasionally of refutations of interpretations that enter anachronously, like the notion of the high school teacher that the tragedy of *Romeo and Juliet* was written to teach girls what would happen to them if they allowed boys to kiss them the first night they met.

By turning his spotlight on successive figures more or less

[1]Published 1938/39 by the Duke University Press, Durham, North Carolina.

in the background of the play, Professor Draper finds a good many ideas hitherto unobserved. Shakspere's audience, he says, deemed Claudius, despite a little fratricide, a pretty fine fellow, and would say that "all his policies are bent to good"; they saw that he was "truly royal," except in Hamlet's imagination. How do we know this? Because the age of James Stuart could not accept the idea of an ignominious king, even in make-believe.[2] Rosencrantz and Guildenstern were "men of loyalty and honor, trying to serve at once their King and their Prince," but they had such contrasting natures that "the former expresses more Hamlet's own merry youth; the latter, the sinister purposes of Claudius."[3] Horatio was "a poor scholar of the University with whom Hamlet grew intimate off-stage during the second act," as any one will agree who will check the usage of *you* and *thou* and accept Professor Draper's interpretation of what the evidence means.[4] Polonius was "an Elizabethan courtier, an Elizabethan father, and Elizabethan noble in high office; and, in all these characters, he was not far-removed from the Elizabethan ideal of what a courtier, what a father, what a 'Worthie Priuie Counseler' should be." The reason for this is that the Renaissance had a "keen sense of official dignity" that would not tolerate a dotard or a fool for a court chamberlain.[5] Ophelia was all that a young lady of noble rank should be—affectionate to her father, fond of her brother, and loyal in her love for Hamlet; for Shakspere would not "have created the heroine of his greatest tragedy as 'trite,' 'theatric,' and indistinctly drawn."[6] Laertes was a typical young English noble, trained to become a courtier, whose devotion to his father excuses his willingness secretly to kill the crown-prince with poison.[7] Queen Gertrude accepted Claudius in "a marriage of convenience to save the dynasty," a marriage that was inconveniently incestuous but still one that would have been considered "reasonable, if not altogether justi-

[2]See pp. 127-151, *passim.*
[3]See pp. 18-23.
[4]See pp. 23-33.
[5]See pp. 34-53.
[6]See pp. 54-61.
[7]See pp. 61-69.

fied" by a "politically minded Renaissance," as Professor Draper, at least, can see by recalling Henry VIII's first marriage.[8]

When we turn from these details to his conclusions about the principal character, we find ideas with which many modern critics would not disagree markedly:

> "Shakespeare's Hamlet then is a perfectly integrated trinity of personalities: the first the soldier-scholar-courtier-lover of his youth, based on the *Bestrafte Brudermord,* the second, the exterior personality that he showed the world, assuming a social charm or a flagrant eccentricity to the point of seeming madness; of this Hamlet also, the *Bestrafte Brudermord* gives evidence; but the third Hamlet is entirely Shakespeare's own, the Hamlet in revolt against the deviousness of his task; the man of action whom events have forced to pause and weigh and wait, who meanwhile sees his world falling about his ears, who strikes at the very root of all he has known and loved because he has come to hate it, but who in the end achieves the one great object for which he gives all else, and by his just revenge at last brings peace to the perturbed spirit of his father: this all-too-human being, struggling and suffering first in doubtful and enforced inaction, then in a tempest of event—a single man against the whole society of his nation and his time, against his friends, his love, his mother, pursuing his inevitable goal, in sorrow and in bitterness of heart to ultimate catastrophe: such a man the Elizabethans would accept as a tragic hero; such are Brutus, Macbeth, Coriolanus, and Antony; and such is Shakespeare's Hamlet."[9]

Likewise in substantial accord with much contemporary criticism is the interpretation of the plot, the style, and the theme.

> "Thus a Renaissance court, at once the center of concentrated absolutism in the person of the king and of a theoretical individualism among the courtiers and scholars that it attracted, presented a complex antinomy of points of view. Surely so complete a contrast might serve as the basis of dramatic conflict: set a single enlightened courtier, a great noble, in opposition to the entrenched power of royalty; make him of royal blood, in fact Crown Prince; make him charming and popular; put right upon his side, a right that he has questioned and tested and found indubitable; let him, in fact, spend half the play in ascertaining the justice of his cause; and, also at the middle of the play, let the king come to realize

[8]See p. 68; pp. 109-126, *passim.*
[9]See pp. 205-206.

> the danger in which he and the whole social structure that depends upon him, stand from this upright and determined individual. The king at once resorts to exile and assassination, but the Prince escapes; the King is driven to more uncertain means; but, at the last, these means forsake him; his fellow-conspirator discloses the plot; and both regicide and revenger go down to destruction. This is the play of *Hamlet.*"[10]

Though not new in any important particular, these remarks about *Hamlet* are, *for the most part,* sound and defensible. In fact, nearly all of them have been advanced and defended by Professor Draper's predecessors and contemporaries in the field. The reader wonders just how these familiar general conclusions became dependent upon the novel ideas about the minor figures encountered in the first half of the book. It is surely defective to imply that trifling matters are central. What difference, for example, does it make how long or how well Hamlet knew Horatio? The playwright needed to give Hamlet a confidant. Horatio must seem fit for the job; that is the extent of his significance.[11]

Professor Draper bases many of his arguments on an oversimple assumption as to the genesis of *Hamlet: Der Bestrafte Brudermord* is considered a German translation of Kyd's play, the *Ur-Hamlet;* Q1, Q2, and F1 are referred to as though they were admittedly three consecutive versions by Shakspere. He pays occasional lip service to the uncertainties involved, but most of the twenty-five indexed passages treat the *Brudermord* simply as Shakspere's source. As recently as 1930 Sir Edmund Chambers (whom we find mentioned repeatedly in this study under the quaint form, "Sir E. K. Chambers") gave us his final opinion, "Q2 substantially represents the original text of the play, as written once and for all by Shakespeare, and . . . F1, Q1, and *Der bestrafe Brudermord* are all in various ways based upon derivatives from that text."[12] It is hardly carping for a

[10]See pp. 241-242.

[11]*Cf.* G. L. Kittredge, *Shakspere* (Cambridge, 1916), pp. 19-22. "Shakspere always follows the established Elizabethan method, which was to make every significant point as clear as daylight, and to omit nothing that the writer regarded as of importance . . . Nothing that is omitted is of any significance. We are not at liberty, therefore, to enrich the plot with our own inventions."

[12]*William Shakespeare* (Oxford, 1930), I, 412.

reviewer to insist that an argument is no sounder than its premises.

Too often the reader of *The Hamlet of Shakespeare's Audience* observes an inadequacy of proof. We are told, for example, that when the Ghost calls Claudius "adulterate" the epithet means merely *unchaste* and does not reflect upon Gertrude's faithfulness to her first husband for two reasons: (1) because *NED* says it can mean *unchaste* or *lewd,* and (2) because when the Ghost says, " 'that incestuous, that adulterate beast' the two adjectives *seem*[13] to be purely a synonymous intensification . . . and the order . . . *suggests*[13] that they cannot allude to two separate acts or conditions; for in that case 'adulterate' *should*[13] precede." Sound scholarship does not consist of the positive affrmation of mere possibilities.

Anyone interested in collecting specimens of loose logic in the field of literary study, as this reviewer confessedly is, can read the book with sardonic pleasure. The minor details are frequently inversions of accepted ideas that one is impelled to wonder if he has taken, as a method, Professor Kittredge's remark about "sophistry enough to turn commonplaces into paradoxes by standing them on their heads."[14] Plausible paradoxes *do* get into the scholarly journals, but from there they pass rather quietly into the "junk-heaps for a variorum to sort and sift."[15]

[13]Italics are mine. See pp. 112-113.
[14]*Op. cit.,* p. 8.
[15]*Ibid.,* pp. 31-32.

Wayne University
Detroit, Mich.

EDITORIAL NOTES AND COMMENTS

By S. A. T.

HAMLET *vs.* LAERTES

In her highly interesting and scholarly essay on the fencing bout between Hamlet and Laertes, Miss Guttman shows convincingly that Professor Wilson's attempt to alter the generally accepted practice on the stage has nothing to commend it. A point which Miss Guttman has not considered, not being directly relevant to her subject, is Dr. Wilson's wholly unsupported assertion (in footnote 1 on page 282 of *What Happens in Hamlet*) that Laertes was entitled "to have first pick" of the foils because he was "the fencer challenged." Those who have had the patience to wade through his exegesis know how material this point is to his argument, but no one seems yet to have taken the trouble to show how utterly wrong he is. If there is one thing certain about this many-problemed play it is this: Hamlet, not Laertes, was the person "challenged."

In the first place, be it noted, Claudius says nothing (in IV, vii) about how the match is to be brought about. All he says is, "We'll . . . bring you together and wager on your heads." Then he says (line 156, ed. Furness), "We'll make a solemn wager on your cunnings." In both these passages the "We" is the royal plural. The anxious king could not have been content to wait for Hamlet to challenge Laertes. From the interview between Hamlet and Osric (V, ii) it is certain that "the king hath wagered with him [Laertes] . . . that in a dozen passes between yourself and him, he shall not exceed you three hits." It is evident from this that there is here no challenge (a wager is not a challenge) and that Hamlet is not the challenger. That the bout did not originate with Hamlet is also proved by the words of the Lord whom the King sends to know "if your pleasure hold to play with Laertes, or that you will take longer time." This clearly implies that Hamlet could have asked for a postponement—which would be out of the question if he had been the "challenger." Furthermore, one can hardly imagine the challenger to say to his opponent, as Hamlet does (V, ii, 242-44):

> "I'll be your foil, Laertes; in mine ignorance
> Your skill shall, like a star i' th' darkest night,
> Stick fiery off indeed."

A point which cannot admit of any other interpretation than that Hamlet was the party challenged is his saying to Osric, "How if I answer 'No'? *i.e.*, if I decline the invitation to engage in such a bout.

Indubitably, Mr. Wilson cannot tell us what happens in *Hamlet.*

ELIZABETHAN ENGLAND

All persons interested in Shakspere's environment, the milieu in which he lived and worked, will be delighted with a portfolio of forty-one beautiful collotype plates (16½ x 12 inches) just published by the Boston Museum of Fine Arts, together with a very well-written explanatory booklet (32 pages) by Professor Franklin B. Williams of Harvard University. The plates are made from the finest photographs obtainable and printed on heavy rough-finish paper; under each picture is an adequate caption. Teachers and lecturers wishing to illustrate the Elizabethan period, its costumes, architecture, prominent personalities, games, etc., cannot do better than to show their audiences and pupils these hand-

some plates. The set, the first of a series of 400 portfolios dealing with the world's past, sells for only $5. (to subscribers for the series, $4.).

THE CLASSIC PLAYERS AND *KING LEAR*

We take this opportunity to congratulate our friend and fellow-member, Dr. Bob Jones, on the completion of the tenth year of the activities of his group of young, enthusiastic, intelligent, and flexible theatrical organization: The Classic Players. Under the stimulating guidance of this charming, handsome, and sweet-voiced Dr., who began his Shaksperian activities long before he became a "Dr.", students attending Bob Jones College in Cleveland, Tennessee, were encouraged and inspired to read, study, and act Shakspere's masterpieces. Their record of achievement includes *The Merchant of Venice, Othello, Hamlet, Henry IV, Twelfth Night, Julius Caesar, Henry V, The Tempest,* and *King Lear,*—a record of which even the most distinguished theatrical company might be proud.

We have just received a handsomely illustrated and well-printed 16-page booklet about The Classic Players which we examined with real curiosity and great interest. One of the most suggestive things in it is an unusual (unorthodox) comment on *King Lear* by Mr. Thomas Brahan, reprinted from *The Chattanooga Times.* His father, Mr. Brahan tells us, was of the opinion that *King Lear* is not a study in ingratitude, Shakspere's most detested human vice, but of monstrous egotism and demoniacal rage. "The king," he said, "was not a generous father; he exacted, by virtue of severe penalties, the most abject adulation." The old man, in fact, "received from his daughters better than he merited, for Cordelia loved him." Lear divided his kingdom because he wanted his children to grovel before him, "to behave like the cherubims and seraphims of the hymn." And, in fact, *Lear* is "a play about a wicked father and his most natural daughters,"—"enforced endearments provoke the bitterest hatred." Well, it's a viewpoint—and much can be said for it.

FRANCIS MERES

One of the most notable publications of recent months, though it has not been awarded a Pulitzer prize, is the facsimile reprint of Francis Meres's *Palladis Tamia* by Scholars' Facsimiles and Reprints (100 West 31st St., New York). Meres was not a very profound scholar and his literary judgments will not stand comparison with those of George Saintsbury, Matthew Arnold, or Walter Pater. But to Shaksperian scholars this book—the rest of his writings have long since been assigned to merited oblivion—is of the greatest value: it not only serves as an important, probably our most important, guide to the chronology of Shakspere's works, but also tells us how highly Shakspere was appreciated by his contemporaries who recognized in him their greatest poet and dramatist when he was only thirty-four years old.

Very few copies of the first (1598) edition of this book are extant, and only one (formerly Dr. Rosenbach's) which contains the preface in which the author roasted his ignorant publisher in Latin and which was subsequently torn out of extant copies. The passages dealing with Elizabethan poets have been frequently reprinted, but this is the first time that the book as a whole has been made available to scholars. The presentation is enriched not only with the missing preface but with an interesting though scholarly introduction by Professor Don Cameron Allen. We are informed that this excellently printed and neatly bound book of almost 700 pages can now be purchased for $7.50 (originally published for $10.).